SCOTLAND'S SUPPRESSED HISTORY

Other books by
M. E. M. DONALDSON

WANDERINGS IN THE WESTERN HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS

FURTHER WANDERINGS—MAINLY IN ARGYLL

ISLESMEN OF BRIDE

THE ISLES OF FLAME

THE WAYFARER'S CHRISTMAS VISION—A MYSTERY PLAY

The 'Bludy Banner' of the Covenanters

SCOTLAND'S SUPPRESSED HISTORY

BY

M. E. M. DONALDSON

"*An Ethiopian must be painted black, and this is no fault of the painter.*"

—Jacob Curate

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W

First Edition 1935

Made in Great Britain. Printed by Sherratt & Hughes,
at the St. Ann's Press, Manchester

THIS BOOK
IS
DEDICATED
CHIEFLY
TO
ALL SCOTS
WHO ARE
PRESBYTERIANS:
THEN TO
OTHER SCOTS
AND LASTLY
TO ALL INTERESTED
IN
SCOTLAND

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	A Purely Personal Preface	9
	Impersonal Preface	27
I	A Historical Approach to the Others	33
II	Edinburgh Introduces and Epitomises	56
III	Glasgow Continues the Exposure	94
IV	Scotland's Greatest Curse	125
V	The Covenanters Speak for Themselves, and so do "the Curates"	163
VI	The Case of Claverhouse: Tradition *versus* History	201
VII	Something about the Inclinations of the People, and the Persecution of the Episcopalians	238
VIII	Scottish Episcopacy: Where it still Survives and Where it was Suppressed	272
IX	The Witness of Aberdeen: City and County	304
X	Appendix	341
	Books recommended to Readers	347
	• Short Bibliography	351
	Index	359

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

The " Bluidy Banner " of the Covenanters *Frontispiece*

Facing page

Archibald Campbell, Marquis and 8th Earl of Argyll. From the Newbattle portrait . . 161

John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. From the mezzotint in the Bodleian Library, Oxford 202

Priest baptizing from the window of Stonehaven Gaol 258

A PURELY PERSONAL PREFACE

THIS is to explain why this book came to be written, and to anticipate the resentment which will inevitably be aroused by the exposure of favourite fictions which have hitherto held the field in place of unwelcome facts. But fair-minded readers are likely to agree that those who will be most wrathful are just those who are the lineal successors of past ministers who verbally, and by their writings, have made this book necessary.

I was brought up amongst Established Presbyterians, but I was never one of them. At an early age I rebelled against a religion which repelled me in every possible way—a repulsion which I attribute partly to an innate historical sense and one which subsequent studies fully justified. Some of my early years and many months of later ones were spent in Scotland, where, indeed, I first went to school. Not only was I taken to Established Presbyterian services, but I met, every Sunday at supper, a long succession of "assistants". These are peculiar Presbyterian paradoxes—men who, although unordained and therefore denied the name of "minister", yet in all except sacramental observances, act and dress as such, and even print "Rev."—together with their degrees—on their visiting cards. Some of the erstwhile assistants are

still alive, one of them having occupied the most exalted and therefore entirely anomalous position in the Scottish Establishment, which, like all other Presbyterian bodies, has as its fundamental doctrine, the equality of all ministers.

My memories of Presbyterian services are of an all-pervading dreariness, of prolix prayers, and as the climax, an interminable and dull sermon, generally from the Old Testament, not one word of any of which sermons can I remember. But worst of all to me were the dreadful jingles, and what I came to call the accompanying "Genevan groans", of the "psalms in metre" so dear, I know—though I cannot understand why—to many good and holy Presbyterians. To this day should any of these whining, drawling tunes be imported into our services for hymns, such is the depth of misery these recall and induce, that I am forced to leave church till they are over. These psalm tunes, too, increased the aversion I felt for the repugnant ceremony of forced "family prayers", conducted amongst all the dirty dishes after breakfast. Again, even now, though it is the Octave of Christmas, I cannot shake off my antipathy to "New Year's Day", which in view of its heathen origin, St. Chrysostom inveighed against as "the devil's festival", but which Presbyterianism substituted for Christmas. To see all the shops open in Glasgow (as they used to be) and "business as usual" everywhere on Christmas Day, the anniversary of the Holy Nativity, and in its place the purely secular observance of the new year's birth, the season of the old Saturnalia, struck

me then, as it does still, as unutterably shocking.

Of all the ministers and assistants I met, I was astonished to find that the latter with few exceptions, were ill at ease outside the pulpit, even with the friendliest people and in kindliest surroundings. Constantly amongst my own Presbyterian friends I heard complaints of these assistants because of this, and even contrasts—not very flattering to them—with the prevalent type of Anglican clergy. (Subsequently I found out this very striking difference myself.)

As the Presbyterian ministry in Scotland, like the Roman Church in Ireland, is so largely recruited from one class, this probably accounts for the arrogance and intolerance of the Presbyterian system. Indeed, I remember a dear old Presbyterian friend telling me on one occasion that there could be no greater tyrant than a Presbyterian minister. Generally these were, and the assistants I met developed into, either self-sufficient, pompous or bumptious men, inflated with a sense of their own importance, largely derived from their State-conferred status of being Established. The U.P.[1] ministers of my day were of quite a different type.

I well remember one Sabbath school "treat" when, after bags of comestibles had been distributed to the wretched children solemnly seated at their

[1] These initials were almost universally used for "United Presbyterian", the body that in 1900 joined with the Free Kirk, apart from a minority of the latter, to form the U.F. (or United Free) Kirk, now for the most part united with the present Establishment.

day-school desks, the assistant provided their sole "entertainment". This consisted of a tedious and tiresome disquisition about himself, and the importance that would in consequence attach to the lucky parish of the remote minute island which was depriving them of his services. Later, when he was "called" to another parish, he became a prominent figure in the Establishment, and, of course, a D.D. Despite the heavy sprinkling of these D.D. (mostly honorary) degrees amongst Presbyterian ministers, and their course of training—longer than that prescribed for Anglican ordinands—which is supposed to produce higher attainments, I have never come across any such results. On the contrary. But I have in England attended innumerable classes in Church History, Greek, etc., given (without fee) by "mere curates"—simple B.A.'s, but judicial scholars, whose erudition well sustained the old papal tribute that the learning of the Anglican clergy was *stupor mundi*.

Of the ministers that I knew who were cultured men, I think first of the late Dr. Donald MacLeod, of the Park parish, Glasgow: courteous, gentle and kindly—even to a reputed "very bad girl". But he, of whom I saw most, had none of the characteristics I associate with the typical Established minister—except that of lowly birth. He was a transparently good man, simple, earnest, of unaffected kindness, and, most remarkable, humble-minded. He was the only minister of all I met in those early days who did not later attain to any eminence whatever in the Establishment.

When in England I was not taken to the Presbyterian chapel with its Highland minister, but to a Congregational one which had a Lowland Scot as ' pastor ", for he was considered much the better preacher. I found little or no difference between the services and setting here and those of Established Presbyterianism. There was the same hideous building, with the pulpit the dominating feature, as the sermon was dominant in the service. In one thing only was Established Presbyterianism superior in my youthful mind. It was the custom there to be regaled throughout the service with " pan peppermint drops ". These formed no part of the particular Congregational ritual under which I suffered. On the other hand, the " pastor ", wearing just his ordinary clothes in the pulpit, did not present the, to my mind, grotesquely inflated figure of the Presbyterian minister swamped in his voluminous black gown, expressing, for me, so exactly the inherent gloom of Presbyterianism.

And again, if the activities of the Congregational minister were only a little less restricted than those of the Presbyterian ministers I met, yet those of his congregation were considerable. They ran Bible classes, a debating society, a gymnasium, etc., and were full of life. This unfavourable comparison detracted still more from Established Presbyterianism in my eyes, for I abhorred slothfulness. With its Kirk doors closed from " Sabbath " to " Sabbath ", and " Sabbath " school treats its only social function, Established Presbyterianism appeared to me as the very embodiment of apathetic slackness,

compared with which a "Low and lazy" English Church parish seemed pulsating with life.

I can still remember some scraps of one or two sermons with which the English Congregationalists were edified by their dour Lowland preacher—cheap sneers at the English Church, her liturgy, bishops, and the outstanding local clergy. Very soon Congregationalism and Presbyterianism jointly, together with a severe enforcement of "Sabbath keeping", raised all the devil—a good supply—in me. They roused and sustained for a long while a heart-whole hatred which alienated me from all religion, for I identified religion with coercion and cruelty.

By a spirited, healthy, and naturally energetic child, "Sabbath" prohibitions were resented with a defiant temper, and Sunday became the hated day of the week. For then, besides playthings being locked away, there was substituted for the beloved "Boys' Own Paper" and G. A. Henty's masterpieces, namby-pamby drivel like Guthrie's "Tales of the Covenanters"; "The Death of Little Lottie, or Mother's Precious Lamb"; or "How Johnny spent his Penny"—giving it, of course, to the Society for the Prevention of Puseyism. One might not run, of course, on the "Sabbath", or a slap corrected this fall from grace, and once occasioned a literal fall to earth.

Of later years in Scotland I have a lively memory of being rebuked for reading the "Church Times", (for it was a newspaper,) writing a letter home, and proposing to take a bath on a Sunday night. These offences were all the more heinous because I was

guilty of "riding in the rigging o' the Kirk" i.e. being exact in my own religious observances.

But to return to England and earlier years. I was aged about fourteen when there was the momentous occurrence which was permanently to change my whole attitude towards religion. An old nurse was allowed to take us out with her on Sundays to Evensong, as there was no chapel-going except in the morning. I found, of course, any of the parish churches a complete contrast to, and a happy release from, the penance of either Congregational or Presbyterian services. Instead of nondescript, barren, and soulless buildings to which no sanctity was attached, there were those obviously designed for something more than an auditorium, and an altar, with the constant remembrance of Christ's dying command, was the focus instead of a swelling pulpit where that remembrance was most infrequent. The effect of a churchly architecture, liturgical worship and, above all, the pre-eminence given to the Holy Eucharist, was reflected in the general reverence of the congregations. At first, dragged as unwillingly to church as to chapel, it was not long before I actually became attracted by the "debased religion" and the "parrot-like repetitions" I had heard sourly denounced in the morning. It satisfied my strong historical sense: I felt that the Anglican Church was no new thing, but that it had its roots deeper in the soil than any other institution in the country.

Then came one never-to-be-forgotten Sunday, the First after Trinity, when I was taken for the first

time to a small church in the poorest part of the town. Architecturally, it could not compare with many another there. Known—but not for this reason—as " the poor man's church ", its new vicar was he who was more bitterly denounced than any other by the Congregational preacher. In this little church I discovered that true religion was not dreary and inhuman, but in every way a cheerful and beautiful thing: that worship centred in a loving Triune Majesty, not in any man in the pulpit. For the first time in my life I learnt what a sermon should be, and to this day I can recount fully in substance the one I heard that evening. It was on the Gospel for the week—the Parable of Dives and Lazarus—and for me it effectively killed the virtual doctrine of "dead and done with " which I had felt to be the only logical conclusion of the Protestant ban on " prayers for the dead ", as " Popish ". Further, I found it effectively disposed of the Presbyterian " Shorter Catechism's " statement, irreconcilably opposed to the Scriptural eschatological doctrines of the Nicene Creed, that " the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory."

I heard, for the first time, the primitive Christian teaching of life beyond the grave: of the thinness of the veil dividing the Church Militant and the Church Expectant, and the rationality of the duty of prayers for those in the fuller life beyond the veil. (I have indicated the subject matter of this sermon since, later, as will appear, its truths were to provide the comforting answers to several problems which,

otherwise, would have greatly distressed me.) Previously in Scotland all the teaching I received was of a terrifying nature—had I been capable of being terrified—and mainly from the Old Testament. The descriptions of hell and the devil were so vivid—sometimes actually localized—that they frequently dwelt in my imagination, and the deep dark pool in the burn had a fearful attraction for me. Often I would stand on the high bridge above it, longing to get a glimpse of "the old gentleman", who, I believed, would indeed get hold of me if I fell in, and fling me into the flaming fire within the pool, since no water would avail to quench that.

But to revert to my continuance at Evensong at the "poor man's church". I came to love the Book of Common Prayer from one end to the other. Its Preface, and the Preface to the Ordinal, with their insistence on continuity, made the strongest appeal to my historical sense: so, too, did the Athanasian Creed, with its careful safeguarding of the Faith from every heretical attempt at its mutilation. But above all, I loved the inspiration and beauty of its prayers, so many of them from the most ancient sources, and all of them hallowed by the use of saints who, for nearly 350 years, had found in the Prayer Book their treasury of devotion—prayers that still unite fellow-Churchpeople separated by distance, in one common, ordered worship.

After experience of the Prayer Book, which I felt did indeed "give unto the Lord the honour due unto His Name", and did enable one to "worship the Lord with holy worship", I felt more than ever

the deficiencies and inadequacies of extempore prayers. So, naturally, as one result of my church-going, came the determination to be confirmed, which automatically and at once, would rule out attendance at Congregational, Presbyterian, and every other sectarian service.

I wanted many things at this time: such as to own and be allowed scope for the use of carpenter's tools, and a pistol: to go to Oxford and to see all the places associated with King Charles the Martyr, (to whom I have ever been devoted), and to work heart and soul against Gladstone and Liberalism—these were inherited aversions. But I wanted nothing so desperately as to be confirmed. This, however, was not to be tolerated: on the contrary it was sternly denounced. Chapel-going in the morning was still enforced, but, mercifully, Sunday Evensong was not stopped. My determination to be confirmed, however, only grew stronger, and I at once began with great zeal the study—from all view-points—of the history of the Church Catholic in general, and of the English and Scottish branches of it in particular: of patrology, liturgiology, and dogmatic theology. I also seized every chance of attending innumerable lectures on these subjects, given by such authorities as, amongst many, the late Dr. Collins, the learned young Bishop of Gibraltar; the late Dr. G. F. Browne, some time Bishop of Bristol; and the late Dr. Gore, Bishop of Oxford.

I can never forget the fresh revulsion of feeling which followed upon my discovery of the unscrupulous falsehoods and suppressions with which

Presbyterian ministers and writers, just like Papal apologists, had bolstered up their system. I felt that if Presbyterianism required the continuous and continual exercise of such moral turpitude for its support, then it was self-condemned—a condemnation even beyond anything that it would receive from unfalsified history.

A further thing that I thought was all wrong was that the ministers of parishes in the poorest parts of Glasgow and Edinburgh should live in more fashionable quarters—never amongst their own people, like English parish priests, or even as the despised Scottish Episcopal clergy, e.g. of Christ Church in the former, and Old St. Paul's in the latter city.

After fighting for years single-handed and back to the wall, at length the day of victory came. I was, at my own earnest request and with the bishop's sanction, conditionally baptised [1], confirmed and afterwards, of course, communicated. Now, at last, I could make my own Psalm 124 as an act of fervent thanksgiving: at last, the snare was indeed broken and I was delivered.

But in Scotland there was further opposition to face, for there could never be any throwing of the Prayer Book out of the window when the Border was crossed. As I rigidly stuck to my guns, a callow assistant, invited for the purpose, was shut up in the drawing-room with me, to take me to task for refus-

[1] I had read in Dr Sprott's "Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland" that he had heard of some ministers who were careful to let the water fall "not upon the child's face, but upon its garments".

ing to attend any other services than those of the Anglican Communion. I soon found out that this young man—afterwards, when he was "called to a charge", to become quite a minor light—was purely Socinian, or "Unitarian", in his views. He had not even heard of the Nicene Creed, much less of the Arian controversy and the epoch-making Council of Nicaea. Very soon he turned tail and fled.

But there were left other more practical means to prevent my getting up on Sunday mornings in time to walk two miles to service at 8. An attempt was made one Saturday night when I was asleep to remove my watch from under my pillow, and also rob me of a small cross—a great offence—attached. But I woke and frustrated the attempt. So it was with all that the Church enjoined—the observance of Friday equally with Sunday—nothing was left undone in an attempt to break my allegiance. As this only made me—permanently—more tenacious than ever of my principles, when my twenty-first birthday came I was told exactly to what an extent I had lost materially by my "bigoted intolerance."

I can fancy some readers being disposed to dismiss these instances of Presbyterian persecution as being now things entirely of the Victorian past. Actually it was at the end of the last reign that I was tramping alone one Saturday on the Island of Eigg (where most of the people are Roman Catholics,) when a big, burly minister caught me up. Without any preface, although we were complete strangers to one another, he demanded if I were going to his church to-morrow. In vain did I tell him that was

my own concern. It was, he insisted, *his* business, as parish minister, to question me. There was no escape from him as our way homeward was in the same direction. So I told him what I was and my invariable practice, whereupon there followed torrents of invective which lasted till the manse gate was reached, when at last I was free of him. (Next morning I had the parish priest round to apologise for him as "really quite well-meaning". That priest is still my friend as well as one other Highland minister, for I met only another who was a bully, and only one more—in the Highlands—who was of the objectionable type.)

Of Presbyterian intolerance in other spheres, I give some recent instances; two personal. The first was during the last General Election when, despite my record of administrative work in England, I could find no scope for my political activities in Scotland, for, I was told apologetically, "religion [1] enters into politics here so much, and the Presbyterian element is *so* strong." Thus I went to work in England again where such "religion" does not enter into politics. The second instance took place during the last County Council Election when a zealous Presbyterian worked hard against me simply because, as he tacitly admitted, I was an Episcopalian, although it was simply a contest between one who "got things done" and another who could make no such claim.

Only in 1932 complaints were made at the Representative Church Council of the Scottish Episcopal

[1] See page 175

Church of the difficulty experienced all over Scotland in obtaining from booksellers the Scottish Prayer Book of 1929. Generally it is not stocked, and several members complained that there were constant attempts to " palm off " an English Prayer Book when the Scottish Book was specially asked for.

But nothing reveals more fully the continuance, in out of the way places, of the old Covenanting spirit than the absorbingly interesting annual Reports of the [Isle of] Lewis Church Fund, issued by Canon H. Anderson Meaden from Stornoway Parsonage, Lewis. Year after year these tell of the relentless and bitter opposition to the varied social as well as to the religious activities of the Scottish Episcopal Church there: of church windows deliberately broken again and again, and of the shocking conduct, not uncommon in the Highlands, of Presbyterian funerals.[1] In fact, there has been nothing published more illuminative of the continuance of the old Presbyterian tradition. It also witnesses to the devotion of a priest who has preferred his difficult and ill-paid post to several good English livings.

As for " Sabbath keeping ", as opposed to a Christian observance of Sunday, there are still many parts of the Highlands, like the Isle of Lewis, where Established equally with Free Presbyterians are grotesquely fanatical on the subject. Indeed, in many cases, " Sabbath keeping " seems to be accepted as the " the whole duty of man ", condoning, apparently, lapses in the observance of other

[1] See pp. 118–119

Commandments. As regards this, the Lewis Church Reports recount yearly many amazing incidents. Indeed, it is most saddening to observe the tenacity with which these Presbyterians, true to the Presbyterian tradition, will cling to this Judaism whilst entirely ignoring Christ's own command: "Do this in remembrance of Me."

Do I blame those who did their utmost, first to keep me out of the Anglican Communion, and then to make me disloyal to many of my convictions? God forbid: they only acted according to their lights—in accordance with their Presbyterian traditions. I loved some of them, and I forgave everyone with all my heart. They have all now passed away into the Land of Life, where, as I was taught those many years ago, I have regularly and faithfully followed them in prayer. I have prayed that there, in the place of waiting, they might have that true light of which we all stand in so much need, and that they might find peace and happiness in the unity of the Faith where there is neither Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, nor any other sect.

It is thus that, without any disloyalty to their memories, I can write as I have written. More especially is this possible as shortly after death, one, without any seeking on my part, came to me whilst I was pursuing some ordinary avocation. What passed between us is, of course, not for publication. But as a result, the unquiet spirit received the desired assurance, and my own spirit was flooded with

happiness, in the sure knowledge that at last we were at one. That happiness I have never lost, and hope never to lose.

After this that I have written, my many living Presbyterian friends, one of them most loyal and my oldest, and many of them the salt of the earth, cannot feel that this book is directed against them, much less against theirs, some of whom were amongst my dearest friends. I may, by the transposition of " Presbyterian " for " Roman Catholic", make my own some words from the introduction of Dr. G. G. Coulton's first volume on " Romanism and Truth." " I must . . . . plead . . . . that the very plain words I shall have to use in this book need not affect the majority of sincere Presbyterians . . . . I am not concerned with their Inner Life except in sympathy." But, though this book owed its inception to discussions initiated by Presbyterian friends long years ago, it is in face of the " unrestricted conversations " which have taken place between Anglicans and Established Presbyterians that I have been moved to write it now, and to have resisted the insistent impulse would have been, for me, a sin of moral cowardice. For I am under no delusion regarding the ministerial malice with which it will be received in Scotland. The adoption of a pen name would afford me safe shelter from this: I prefer to come out into the open.

But though I cast no blame on those whose belief was implicit in every word which, as an infallible utterance, fell from a minister's lips, I do blame all those ministers who have fostered and nourished and

passed on Scotland's suppressed and perverted history; and those specially recent writers, who still persist in so doing. It is the Presbyterian tradition of intolerance, arrogance, and unscrupulous misrepresentation—a tradition akin to that of Papalism—that I attack.

If I have written anything demonstrably untrue—which, God forbid—I only ask to be publicly arraigned by some Established minister and writer, in Edinburgh or Glasgow, under a chairman whose fairness cannot be impugned. If I am convicted of any serious misstatement, I will make public acknowledgment of my inadvertent error. But until what I have written is proved to be false, I pray God that any projects for intercommunion between the Anglican Communion and the Scottish Establishment, as involving a grave moral issue—besides fundamental differences—may, by His mercy, be averted.

M. E. M. DONALDSON

St. Bride's Day, 1934.

IMPERSONAL PREFACE

This book is intended as an Eye-opener for Everyman, and a claim that the facts it rescues from suppression must oust fiction from its place in popular Scottish history. For, as it has been truly observed, " The popular Scottish history taught in schools has nothing true about it except the names dates."

For all too long fictions, in the interests of Presbytery, have persistently posed as facts, more especially in the post-Reformation history of Scotland, with which, almost exclusively, this book is concerned. In modern times writers like Andrew Lang, and more recently, honest Presbyterians like John Buchan, Sir Thomas Raleigh, and the Rev. W. S. Provand have demonstrated—some more, some less—the falsity of popular presbyterianized history.

Impervious to truth, however, popular—and even some weightier—Presbyterian writers persist in repeating their mythical stories. Without any attempt at critical writing but with unskilled labour instead, they have set up their dethroned idols once again. They, following one another like sheep, have busied themselves with giving those damaged idols fresh coats of whitewash. They have be-

daubed again with pitch such a noble figure as Claverhouse—for his supreme sin of suppressing fanatical and rebellious Presbyterians as a danger to the State. Thus by reason of tireless reiteration, shouted from the house-tops, fictions have come to be accepted and are firmly established in the popular mind as the true history of Scotland. Again, a churchman has said with truth: "All Scottish public schools are denominational, not because they teach the 'Shorter Catechism', but because they teach ecclesiastical history which is excessively biassed and designed to damage our religion."

These fictions are all summed up in the crowning impudence of equating Scotland and Presbyterianism, and its correlative in persistently dubbing the native Scottish Episcopal Church—the old disestablished Church of Scotland—the "English" Church. Whilst this wrong style is frequently used in all innocence by Scots misled by subverted history, it is as often deliberately fostered to keep alive prejudice against the Church.

On that false premise that "Scot" and "Presbyterian" are synonyms, every Presbyterian place of worship abroad is called the "Scots Church", and such a regiment, e.g. as the London Scottish (where the "Scottish" element is swamped in the London), Presbyterian ministers are appointed as chaplains, even when Presbyterians may be, as they certainly were during the Great War, in the minority therein.

How Presbyterianism was imposed upon Scotland until Presbyterians outnumbered members of all

other communions there, is part of Scotland's suppressed history.

In following this, the affinity between Presbytery and Papalism in their lines of argument, love of temporal power, and in their unscrupulous attitude in support of their respective systems, will be seen. Whilst the one says in effect " No Presbyterian, no Scot," the other asserts " No Roman Catholic, no Catholic." If the Roman system appeals to untruthful statements,[1] to the Fathers (falsified), the Forged Decretals, and other equally spurious writings in support of its claims, so too, the Presbyterian has persistently both perverted and ignored facts which from start to finish, entirely demolish its particular pretensions.

Centuries ago the likeness between Rome and Presbyterianism was remarked by one well qualified to speak. Charles I., on February 19th, 1646, wrote, not very tactfully, to his Roman Catholic Queen: *" I assure thee, I put little or no difference between setting up the Presbyterian Government or submitting to the Church of Rome."* In an earlier letter (March 5th, 1645) he had written what was then the simple truth, that *" Presbytery was anti-monarchical, seditious and intolerable,"* and *" It is less ill in many respects to submit to one than many Popes."*

A further affinity between the Church of Rome and Presbyterianism may be noted. For the Church of Rome to admit the well-demonstrated validity, on Catholic principles, of Anglican Orders, would necessarily involve her in a tacit admission of her

[1] See p. 238.

schismatical position in England. Similarly with Presbyterians in Scotland. For them to recognize the plain facts of history, without either suppression or falsification, would be to put them completely out of court in their three-fold claim: (1) to be Scottish in origin; (2) to have reverted at the Reformation to the Faith and Order of the Columban Church; and (3) to owe their present status as "Church of Scotland" to "the inclinations of the generality of the people" as expressed in 1689. The first and last of these claims appeal merely to a spurious patriotism which is completely anti-Catholic in its narrow exclusiveness. The second alone concerns the supreme question as to whether or no Presbyterians have preserved, in a Catholic sense, any continuity with the Catholic Church which the earliest missionaries of Christianity set up in the country now known as Scotland.

After what has been written in the Personal Preface it is obvious that the writer makes no pretence of impartiality—in either sense of the word. A complementary partiality, in its primary sense, is demanded by justice: it is also, of course, postulated by the very title of the book. But the writer's purpose will not be fully accomplished unless readers afterwards turn their attention to one or more of the multitude of popular books where Scottish history is presbyterianized. The more of these that are read, the more confirmation will be found of the thesis of this book, many of the statements of which are supported by quotations from authoritative writers—all Presbyterians wherever the contrary

is not stated. For obvious reasons, Presbyterian quotations have been preferred and copiously used.

It is due to the kindness of the Rt. Rev. F. Ll. Deane, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney, that the author received permission to make what use was desired of some copies of MSS. he sent her. The two documents [1] of which it was possible to make use—all having been received when the book was finished—were found among a mass of recently discovered letters, papers, and sermons, mainly belonging to the middle of the eighteenth century. It would have held up going to press indefinitely had the author started a search for details missing particularly in the first paper—the district of Aberdeenshire referred to; its date, etc., which the Bishop's busy life had given him no time to ascertain. But the author hopes, if ever opportunity offers, to discover these missing details.

There will be those disposed to deprecate the raking up of old or "dead and done with" controversies, and who want to know what good purpose will be served thereby. The answer is not only that it is high time the balance was redressed, but that *these old controversies are very much alive*, and are kept so by the regular recurrence of "cauld kail het again"—"new" books on the Covenanters. Indeed, the author's purpose will not be fully served unless and until fair-minded Presbyterians, realizing what a slur rests on their religion, make it their business to obtain the substitution in Scottish schools of new—and true—histories for those that at present

[1] See pp 332–6, 340–1.

entirely misrepresent Scottish history. Is such an aim to be deprecated?

Further these "old controversies" are becoming implicit in the increasingly arrogant attitude of Presbyterians towards Scottish Episcopalians, if not towards Anglicans generally. And the purpose that will be served by the exposure of the Presbyterian tradition is the highest—truth, "*for charity . . . . rejoiceth in the truth.*"

Chapter I

A HISTORICAL SETTING FOR THE OTHER CHAPTERS

It is the myth that " Scot " and " Presbyterian " are interchangeable terms—with its many implications—that is responsible for Scotland's suppressed history and its perversion. Similarly Episcopacy is to be wholly identified with England, Scotland's enemy, despite the fact that St. Ninian, Scotland's first apostle, was indisputably a bishop, and that in the Columban Church " the episcopal office was considered essential to the Church ". Following their fictions, Presbyterian partisans have so persistently followed one another in writing each " his story " that these have come to be accepted generally as true history.

Recently, in order to make St. Ninian fit into presbyterianized history, he is actually represented as one of a rival religion to St. Columba, setting up a " Pictish Church " in opposition to the Celtic. Until lately, the favourite Presbyterian presentation of St. Columba was as a Presbyterian separatist—centuries before Presbyterianism ever came into existence. But two peculiarities of the Celtic Church—both completely outside the scope of Presbyterianism—are curious points on which to base a likeness. For these trifling differences regarding the date of

Easter and the form of the tonsure, no more separated the Celtic Church from the rest of Christendom than priestly beards and marriages cut off the Uniat Churches of the East from the Roman Communion to-day. Yet, nevertheless, so are the present deplorable divisions of Christianity anachronistically read into a past which knew them not. Another not less flimsy line is taken when Presbyterians, equating independence with separatism, actually base a continuity for themselves both with St. Ninian and St. Columba merely on this supposed identity of Celtic "independence" of the rest of Christendom. It is open at least for the body known as Scotch Baptists to make precisely the same claim. On the same principle, too, a continuity of identity might be established between Czardom and Soviet Russia, on the claim that tyranny was a feature of both. But whereas this is undeniable, any point of contact between the Celtic Church's "independence," as misunderstood by Presbyterians, and that alleged of their own system, has yet to be demonstrated.

Other entirely wrong conclusions have been arrived at by most Presbyterian apologists, who invariably confound *Jurisdiction* with *Holy Order*. Celtic bishops certainly did not bear rule as subsequently their lineal descendants—as regards Order—the diocesan bishops did. But to attempt to base the whole Presbyterian structure on a transient matter of jurisdiction, instead of upon a permanent distinction of Orders, is entirely to misconceive the situation.

Outside the Celtic Church and from early times it has been a common thing for such bishops, as were monks, to occupy a subordinate position in a religious community, even though the abbot or prior might be only a priest. There is the case in the life of St. Lambert, Bishop of Maestricht, 673, who had retired to the monastery of Stavalo. He, as a monk, was, of course, in that capacity subject to the abbot though his inferior in Holy Order, to the extent even of performing a severe penance in a case where he was blameless. Such is the essence of the incident of the " Humility of St. Lambert ".

The same conditions prevail to-day in the Church of England. The present Superior of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield is only a priest, yet he has under his rule at least two bishops, one of them Dr. Frere, late diocesan of Truro. There are also several English Cathedral chapters of which bishops, other than episcopal deans, are members, and in these cases it is the dean, even if he be only a priest who holds the ruling power in the chapter.

The fundamental issue between Episcopacy and Presbytery lies in the answer to the question of Jerome, who has sometimes been quoted in favour of the latter system. " What does a bishop do that a priest cannot do except ordain?" This is the crux of the whole matter. The fact is that in the whole of history previous to the Reformation period, only four cases of alleged ordination by presbyters have been adduced—of which St. Columba was *not* one—and in no single instance will the case bear examina-

tion[1]. On the contrary, there is specific witness to the unlawfulness of attempted ordination by a presbyter. The Canons of Hippolytus, obtaining at the end of the second and third centuries, and the Apostolic Constitutions of the latter half of the fourth century, are agreed. The first states: "The power of ordaining is not granted to the presbyter"; and the second: "We do not allow presbyters to ordain."

There is the famous case of the pretended ordination of Ischyras by the priest Colluthus, dealt with in 324 by the Council of Alexandria, which decided that despite the ceremony of ordination Ischyras was still a layman. The official letter of the Council states "that Colluthus was still only a presbyter when he died, and that every ordination of his was invalid and that all who were ordained by him in his schism have come out laymen and are given the position of laymen, is well known, and nobody doubts it."

With reference to these Presbyterian claims, more especially to those of the neo-Presbyterians, the late Dr. Gore wrote: "The claim that a sixteenth century presbyter had, even in an emergency, the same authority as a bishop to ordain, is totally unjustifiable. . . . These Scottish divines appeal to Catholic principles and church law, and on Catholic principles and church law they have, it must be said, no case at all."

Other Presbyterian arguments are vitiated by the common failure to realize that what are now the dis-

[1] See Dr. Gore's *Church and the Ministry*, new edition revised by G. H. Turner, M A., pp. 124-5, and 332-4.

tinctive dogmas of the Church of Rome are merely modern accretions—Roman, *not* Catholic. Historic Catholicism is what has been known from the beginning. Papalism and Protestantism alike are modern novelties: so, too, is the adoption of the word "Catholic" in a new and anti-Catholic sense, as co-extensive with "Christian", by certain Presbyterians. The so-called Reformation in Scotland was no reversion to the ancient faith and worship of the Celtic part of the Catholic Church: it was a complete break with Scotland's Catholic past, remote no less than immediate. In no other country was the need for reformation more clamant. But instead of standing by the Church in any attempt to save her from overthrow, her worthless and craven bishops fled the country, intent only in saving their own skins. So when Scotland lost her Church as well as its corruptions, it was at the price of the devastating influence of John Knox, as outrageous a ruffian in public life as he was irreproachable in his private conduct. "Mainly to Knox we owe it that our Reformation was not a gradual process but a revolution pulling down one system and erecting another, not less rigid, in its place."

It was in 1560 that Knox overthrew the Church, and with it, many of its beautiful buildings [1] and than him "no man has left his sign manual more legibly inscribed in our history." He was the

[1] Although modern "high" Presbyterians persist in declaring that it was not John Knox and his fellow revolutionaries, but earlier English invaders who were responsible for this, the late Professor Cooper flatly contradicts them. He, himself

Father of that species of " Scottish independence " which in the uneducated Lowlander too often proclaims its origin in his uncouth manner and obnoxious personality, and exhibits it in independence of the common courtesies of life as well as in lack of reverence. Entirely typical of this latter characteristic is what may be seen in old churches, now in Presbyterian possession, that are " show places ". Any time that one may go into one of these—such as the nave of Dunfermline Abbey Church, St. Mungo's, Glasgow's old cathedral, and St. Giles', Edinburgh—on week-days, it is common to see men walking about with their hats on, and never are they rebuked. How can they be, indeed, when it is the custom where an official of H.M. Office of Works is in charge, for him invariably to wear his hat inside the building?

It was Andrew Melville, 1545-1622, however, not Knox, who was the true Father of Presbyterianism, a system which was radically based on the equality, or parity, of all ministers. But now the " sturdy independence " of a renegade Presbyterianism finds expression in a ruling passion to " be upsides with " a jealously regarded Episcopacy. Though Presbytery abolished bishops and other prelatical officials, in recent times their distinguishing styles have been appropriated, even for empty offices, in accordance with the " simple Presbyterian practice "—of commandeering everything possible from Episcopalian

a revered " high " Presbyterian, specified eighteen large churches destroyed by Knox and his followers. But they were guilty of the destruction of far more than these.

use and wont to assert the State-conferred position of Presbytery in Scotland. For the same reason there is that contradiction in terms, a Presbyterian "cathedral", where properly a bishop has his *cathedra*, or seat.

True Presbyterianism did not come into being in Scotland till 1592. Previously, a mock episcopacy, which was, in Andrew Lang's words, "unscriptural, untraditional, and intolerable", was approved by Knox, and did much to blacken the real thing. Knox exalted preaching to heights it had never before attained—as a supreme sacrament from which ministers derived their authority, and sacraments and all other services, their efficacy. As the Papal claims to the Roman Church and the historic Episcopate to the Anglican Communion, so is preaching to the Presbyterian system. "Preaching makes a bishop," summarises Knox's teaching, for he deliberately repudiated ordination by the laying-on of hands, including his own to the priesthood. A study of his "Forme of Prayer", the directory of public worship he brought from Geneva to supersede all liturgies, and which latterly became the Book of Common Order, shows the sermon to be the centre and essential of every single service.

Calvinism, that terrible travesty of Christianity, was not imported from Geneva without its outward and visible signs. As Catholicism found expression in beauty of building and of worship alike, so Calvinism became—and still continues to be—embodied in every mean and ugly building set up for and used in the service of its cruel and repellent deity.

Calvinism is typified, too, in the forbidding and hideous post-Reformation towns and villages of Scotland, which were designed, apparently, as a protest against the natural beauty with which the Creator had endowed their situations. It may therefore be affirmed that an exhortation to "Preach to the people in the ugliness of Protestantism" became a natural consequence of Calvinism's inherent protest against all beauty, and of the sovereign position Knox gave to the sermon.

As the supreme court of Presbyterianism, the General Assembly came into being; and ultimately set up, together with Calvinism from Geneva, an imitation of the ecclesiastical policy of the French Calvinists. The lowest court was the Kirk Session, composed of the minister, or "preaching elder", and of "ruling elders"—laymen, chosen like the minister now is, by the congregation. Several parishes made up a Presbytery, and a number of Presbyteries constituted a Synod. These various bodies are still maintained as the government of Presbyterianism.[1] "Thus was the gage of battle thrown down and there was immediately precipitated the conflict which for more than a century unchained some of the worst passions of human nature, and made Scotland the arena where hatred, persecution, and murder proclaimed themselves as champions of the gospel of Jesus Christ."

[1] When, subsequently, Episcopacy was restored, it was with many anomalies, and all these ecclesiastical courts continued to function under the bishops Only after Episcopacy was finally disestablished did they, together with elders, disappear from that system.

When, on the death of Elizabeth, James VI of Scotland became James I of England as well, such was the animosity which Presbyterianism had aroused in him against itself, that he was thankful to betake himself to the freer air of England. In due time, timidly and cautiously, but shrewdly, James set to work to do away with Presbyterianism in his native land, and to restore to her her old authentic episcopate. Thenceforward, religious strife, initiated by Knox, practically monopolized Scotland's history, till the Disruption in 1843.

Great exception has recently been taken in the Diocesan Synods of the Scottish Episcopal Church to the initiation by the English Church of the late "unrestricted conversations". This was on the ground that it was not for the English Church to override her autonomous Scottish sister, who, apart from her native standing, naturally knows Presbyterianism as no English body can. Scotsmen in the Middle Ages constantly repudiated the claims of the Archbishops of York to ecclesiastical supremacy in Scotland. Indeed, it was resistance to this claim that flung Scotland into the arms of the Papacy as England had never been flung. So for the present Archbishop of York to be appointed Anglican chairman instead of the Scottish Primus [1] was certainly ill-omened and one trusts that one of the contradictory voices with which the Archbishop spoke

[1] Only in the Roman Church in Scotland, and that only since 1878, have archbishoprics been revived The Scottish Episcopal Church is governed by the College of Bishops—all equal. One is elected by the others to be "first among equals"—*primus inter pares*, hence "Primus".

will not this time fling any Scots into the arms of Rome.

James VI, however, showed more respect for native prejudices, for when in 1610 the Historic Episcopate—by the vote of the Assembly—was restored to Scotland [1] through the necessary agency of English bishops, the tactful king was careful to exclude from the Consecration Service both the Archbishops.[2]

Four other bishops consecrated in London three Presbyterian ministers direct to the Episcopate, and this action is represented by certain Presbyterian writers as an Anglican recognition of Presbyterian "Orders". It was, in fact, nothing of the sort, for in the special "Act of Consecration", drawn up to meet this particular case, none of the candidates are termed "presbyter". There was, on this occasion, simply a following of primitive precedents of laymen being raised directly to the Episcopate without first passing through the diaconate and priesthood, as normally. Thus in 391, Nectarius, whilst still unbaptised, was elected bishop of Constantinople and immediately after baptism he was consecrated bishop *per saltum*—"by a leap", as the theological term has it.

In respect of this restoration of the Episcopate to Scotland a Presbyterian miracle happened—the first of many. All the Calvinistic importations from

[1] See p. 94

[2] Seven years previously, the last of the pre-Reformation bishops, Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, died abroad, where he had fled. The various kinds of "bishops", who had been given the name, were merely nominal—the inventions of Knox.

Geneva and France, apparently at once became Scottish as soon as they entered Scotland. The English Bible of 1611; later, those products of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643)—the *Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory for Public Worship*, the *Form of Presbyterial Church Government*—all, excepting the Bible, so largely the work of English Puritans—by the simple process of crossing the border, instantly became " our ancient Scottish heritage ". Even the English Metrical Psalter of the English Puritan Francis Rous—which ousted the Psalter of Knox's day—lost its English origin when it entered Scotland.

Such is the miracle invariably worked in favour of Presbyterianism when that system appropriates to itself anything originating outside Scotland. This explains why Episcopacy—the one thing that used to be in Scotland, as elsewhere in Christendom, from the beginning, and was restored in 1610 to Scotland through England—alone escaped nationalization in its passage. Only a miracle could account for such a discrimination, for this unexplained and inexplicable transformation of Presbytery, the complete alien, into the one thing unimpeachably Scottish.

It is precisely the same with some present day practices amongst Presbyterian ministers who have abandoned almost everything distinctive of Presbyterianism both in their buildings and services. Wedding and burial services particularly, taken (without acknowledgement) from the English—not the Scottish—Prayer Book, and used in buildings as

closely approximating " Episcopalian " churches as " High " Presbyterians dare go, are now reported as " in accordance with our simple Scottish [*i.e.* Presbyterian] worship ".

Later again it will be noticed how miracles invariably come to the aid of Presbytery in its awkward dilemmas, so that, thanks to their ever timely intervention, Presbytery, unlike anything else, invariably has it both ways.

On the death of James in 1625, there came to the throne, in Charles I, a man different in nearly every respect from his father. An impediment in his speech made King Charles shy and reserved, and a close study of his character gives the impression that his vacillations were often due to over-conscientiousness. He had ingrained in him the disastrous habit of weighing and pondering the pros and cons of questions so much that he could seldom be sure if his first decision was the right one. On the other hand, however, once fixed in an opinion, he was immovable.

Then, where James was adroit and of acute judgment, Charles lacked both—in the author's opinion for the reason just stated—and was entirely wanting in tact. These defects, however, are not inconsistent with the fact that, than Charles, no man had more sincere religious convictions which, since he refused to renounce them, ultimately issued in his unjudicial murder. If it be argued that Charles the First, in trying to force the old Church of Scotland, restored and reformed—not revolutionized—on his countrymen, was no better than the Covenan-

ters, the answer is to be found in the wording of the National Covenant.[1] There is no parallel whatever between Charles' attempts and what the signatories of the Covenants [2] bound themselves to do. Presbyterian writers almost always refer to Charles I as a " Papist at heart ", or words to that effect,[3] which shows either, that they have read nothing whatever of his expressed religious opinions, or, that they are confusing him with his son Charles II—not at all an uncommon occurrence. There was never anyone more staunchly—and effectively—anti-Papal than the " White King " and his friend Laud.[4] Belloc speaks of their " hearty dislike " of Romanism.

What has next to be noticed is the constant see-sawing between Episcopacy and Presbytery as the " Established religion " of Scotland. It is this fatal hall-marking—whether by the State or the General Assembly, or by both—of these two systems alternately, that lies at the root of all the nauseating ecclesiastical strife that almost exclusively constitutes Scotland's post-Reformation history. This see-sawing suggests nothing so much as the ups and downs of political parties—Tories triumphant at one election, Socialists ousting them at the next, and so on.

The first reformed Episcopate lasted till 1638 when the Glasgow Assembly [5] deposed the bishops

[1] See p. 55. [2] See pp 132–4 for Solemn League and Covenant [3] See p 137. [4] See Chapter IV, p. 138, for more of King Charles in relation to the Covenanters. [5] See pp 97–9.

in favour of Presbyterianism. This remained in the ascendant till 1661, when again Episcopacy was restored to Scotland through English bishops,[1] but this time by regular procedure. How the final triumph of Presbytery came about in 1690, another chapter will tell.[2] No less than three chapters have been necessary to deal at all adequately with the Covenanters, of whom the typical one was the Lowland peasant, thus pictured: " A gaunt, sunburnt, long-legged fellow in a blue bonnet and undyed woollen jerkin, dirty and lazy, vain and proud; living contentedly on oatmeal and kail in a hovel where an Englishman would not have housed his cattle, and strolling out of it on Sundays 'clad like a gentleman ', far from eager to work, and sometimes much too ready to follow his landlord on some disreputable foray—if he liked him; foul-mouthed and loose-living, the despair of his minister, yet withal a keen theologian, with a biting contempt for the churchman who did not live up to his principles; capable of cruelty and treachery to his enemy, and the most self-sacrificing loyalty to his country."

This vivid picture offers a very good clue to the nature of the Covenanting troubles, and should be borne in mind when reading about the Covenanters and contrasting them with their Episcopalian oppo-

[1] Of the Scottish bishops only one had survived, and as Catholic custom required for security three co-consecrators, the consecration took place again in England in Westminster Abbey. The choice of place was surely most tactful, and the bishops there consecrated should surely have been as free from the aspersion of being " English " as the Westminster Confession

[2] Chapter VII.

nents. But for a complete realizing of the picture, "Covenanting" must be interpolated before "principles".

It was certainly no case of "six of one, and half a dozen of the other" as between the conduct of Episcopalians and Covenanters. Whatever may be truly alleged against Episcopalians is overwhelmingly overweighted on the other side. The bishops of the first Episcopate certainly began the practice of deprivation of ministers—an example followed by Presbyterianism. But whereas, in the case of the Presbyterians, deprivation was for refusing to preach in favour of Presbytery, the bishops never reproved any man for refusing to laud Episcopacy in the pulpit, but for fulminating against the Five Articles of Perth (1616). These enjoined (1) kneeling at reception of holy communion; (2) private communion of the sick; (3) private baptism in case of need; (4) observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Whitsun days; and (5) confirmation.[1]

Nor were these initial Episcopal deprivations absolute, as deprivations became when the Covenanters were able to retaliate. The minister deprived by a bishop could preach in any parish except in that from which he had been dismissed, and none were threatened with that excommunication which, in their affinity with Papalism, was one of the Covenanters' favourite non-material weapons.

1 "High" Presbyterians now practise all but the first, though—lacking the Episcopate—what some of them call "Confirmation" bears no relation whatever to that Sacrament as known in any part of the Church.

The supremacy of Episcopacy, indeed, affords no parallel with that of Presbytery, for it was actually Covenanters who, actively led and encouraged by their armed ministers, initiated bloodshed, barbarity, and every negation of Christian principles in the ecclesiastical warfare that disgraced Scotland. The hated bishops and despised curates of the second Episcopate certainly included some informers and those who approved of the execution by the Government of Covenanters for civil rebellion. But the Episcopal clergy never, at any period, numbered an executioner in their ranks. How antagonistic to the smallest deed of mercy were the Covenanters is proved by the case of the Covenanting minister who was reprimanded because, after Tippermuir, he complied with the request of the then Royalist Montrose for a cup of cold water. This affords a case of " the churchman " who did not " live up to his principles ".

The claims of the Covenant were no less imperious than those of the Papacy, for both alike claimed absolute supremacy in the State. Episcopacy, even when proclaiming its divine right, made no such claim. Covenanting doctrines justified both rebellion and murder, and so, by involving anarchy, threatened the very existence of the State. To a Covenanter, the upholding of the Covenants was at once his religion and his politics—inextricable, one and indivisible. Even if, at certain periods, Episcopacy be identified with Jacobitism, the identification is neither complete nor exact, for one, as a religion, had an entity distinct from the other, a dynastic

question; and therefore all Episcopalians were not *ipso facto* Jacobites. Those that were, felt they could not turn their coats without violating their oaths to the legitimate monarch, so that the sanctity of these oaths was involved in their attitude. Episcopacy never made any claim to desert its proper sphere and to usurp the ruling functions of the State, as did the Covenant.

These observations on the Covenants have anticipated a few comments on those two as yet unmentioned monarchs, Charles II and James VII, whose reigns were also troubled by the Covenanting rebellions.

Of Charles II (1660–1685) it may be truly said that in the forming of his character those old allies, "Popery" and Presbyterianism, once again joined hands. During his youth in France immorality was a prevailing feature of the life of Paris, and so far from the Church frowning upon this viciousness, many of the clergy, even in the highest ranks, themselves shared in it. It was exactly the same with the Covenanters—though not so generally as regards their ministers. Over and over again the Covenanting authorities had to draw up documents calling attention to the gross immoralities that obtained under their sway.[1] Though, in opposition to his father the chaste "White King", Charles II might well have been called the "Black King", much more from his shameless profligacy than from his dark countenance, one must bear in mind how the Covenanters assisted in corrupting him in other

[1] See p 143

kinds of immorality. As a young man of twenty they made him perjure himself when they forced him to sign both Covenants (1650) and again before they crowned him.

Later, the Covenanters presented their King with an infamous paper denouncing his father's " opposition to God's work, the Solemn League and Covenant [1] and the idolatry of his mother ". After first refusing to sign the monstrous declaration, Charles weakly gave way, and by signing the paper, slandered his dead father and insulted his mother. Andrew Lang's comment on this is: " Apparently Charles was to conciliate Jehovah by breaking the Fifth Commandment." Now having perjured himself and vilified his parents, he was fit indeed to be crowned King of Scotland at Scone (1651).[2] Even one utterly repelled by the character of Charles II is bound in justice to point out these mitigating circumstances.

It ill becomes supporters of the Covenanters, however, to revile Charles II, their one Covenanted King, as others might revile him, for they helped to make him what he was. Had he not been made by the Covenanters to hate Scotland he would probably, for all his vice, have ruled that country more wisely than did his deputies [3]. As it was, after he was crowned King of England at Westminster he never returned to Scotland.

Of James VII (1685–1688) there is little to say. Despite the fact that he seemed without any personal attraction, James VII received as great a meed of

[1] See pp. 132–4. [2] See p. 148. [3] See pp. 181–3.

devotion in Scotland as any of his race—an attachment all the more meritorious because no glamour attended it. Loyalty never attained greater heights of pure devotion than in those who, under Dundee, rallied round the monarch who had fled his kingdom.

After the Revolution (1688), and when William and Mary began their reign (1689)[1], with the exception of spontaneous local opposition to intruded Presbyterian ministers, there was no more than passive resistance on the part of Episcopalians in the face of Presbyterian persecution. There was not even organized passive resistance.

But hope began to spring within the hearts of the persecuted when James VII's second daughter, Anne, came to the throne (1702–1714). Utterly different from her father, she took rather after her martyred grandfather, for she was not only pure in life but completely devoted to the Church. Her court too, became an example of virtue to all men, as Charles I's had been.

It was to this sympathetic Queen that the Scottish Episcopalians appealed for succour, and she warmly responded by doing all in her power to ameliorate their conditions[2]. Previously, in 1707, the Act of Union of the Two Kingdoms had been passed, rousing great opposition throughout Scotland where, without distinction of class, all sorts and conditions of men were against it. Then, after protracted legal

[1] They reigned jointly till 1694, then William reigned alone till 1702.

[2] See pp. 54, 251.

delays, the long overdue Toleration Act[1] was passed in 1712, giving to the suffering Episcopalians some measure of protection for their worship—greatly to the fury of the Presbyterians.

Their day was coming, however, when another foreigner without even such recommendation as a Stuart wife could give, succeeded Queen Anne as king *de facto*. "German George" (1714–1727) was well nicknamed, for he could not even understand English, refused to learn it, and left what must pass for his heart behind him in the Fatherland. He was a most cruel man: his morals were as gross as those of James VII: his manners disgusting. His son, George II (1727–1760), whom his father hated, was of little better character than he.

Most Presbyterian writers have continuously inveighed against the last three of Scotland's native kings *de jure* and *de facto*. Charles I, despite his purity of life, they abused because he opposed their ecclesiastical system. For this greatest of all iniquities they have also poured out their vials of wrath on Charles II and James VII, seeking to blacken that infamy, were it possible, by truthfully alleging against them their libertinism. But the same Presbyterians were able to overlook the same characteristics in these two first Georges, indisputable Protestants. It was during their reigns that Presbyterianism received every support from the Government in persecution of the Episcopaliāns.

The Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745, as political offences in the eyes of the *de facto* government,

[1] See pp 253, 324–5

naturally had to be dealt with as such by that government. These offences called for punishment by civil and not by religious penalties—the forfeiture of lands, liberty, and life. But the Jacobites were called upon to suffer both, and the Jacobitism of so many Episcopalians and Roman Catholics was made the excuse for burning down their meeting-houses all over the country after Culloden. Had Episcopalians under persecution considered it consistent with Christian principles to act as the Covenanters before them had acted, the kingdom once more would have been a welter of bloodshed and would have rung with the clamour of their sufferings. But Episcopalians believed that Christ Himself had forbidden carnal warfare in defence of His Kingdom, so they bore persecution till they were reduced to "the shadow of a shade", and only a "faithful remnant" was left.

This "faithful remnant" is to-day represented by the Scottish Episcopal Church—the old disestablished Church of Scotland. It was not till this, her final disestablishment, that any general attempt was made to restore liturgical worship, and then the introduction of the English Prayer Book had unfortunate consequences. So impoverished, however, were the Scottish Episcopalians, that it was far easier for them to import Prayer Books from their sister church than to reprint their own superior Prayer Book of 1637—miscalled "Laud's". These English Prayer Books had been brought in, too, by military chaplains for the use of the English troops in Scotland. Later, the use of the English book was

extended by generous grants to the suffering Church in Scotland both by Queen Anne and the University of Oxford. But in 1712 the whole Scottish book of 1637 [Bishop Wedderburn's] was reprinted in Edinburgh; and in 1724 Bishop Gadderar of Aberdeen published, with a few omissions, its distinctive Communion Office. In 1735 this office, with two important alterations, was printed and published, though without any sanction or authority, and these editions, several times reprinted, were, from their diminutive size, known as the " wee bookies ". It was the work of the great liturgiologist, Bishop Rattray of Dunkeld, followed by that of Bishop Falconer of Edinburgh in 1764, that, authorised by the then Primus of the Scottish Church, ultimately issued in the present Scottish Prayer Book of 1929.

Owing, however, to this first use of the English Prayer Book in Scotland, contemporary writers and later, Englishmen, knowing nothing of the Church's history, came to refer to the native Scottish Episcopal Church as " English ".[1] This name Presbyterians eagerly fastened upon her, wilfully ignoring her purely native congregations with, in the Highlands, their Gaelic Prayer Books.

If, however, a use of the English Prayer Book denationalized the Scottish Episcopal Church, what can be said of the Presbyterian body in Scotland which speedily dropped its only native product, Knox's Psalm Book, in favour of everything English or foreign, as this chapter has already shown?

[1] See pp. 254–5.

SOME EXTRACTS FROM

The National Covenant

As signed in 1638 initially in Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh

"We all and every one of us under-written protest . . . that this only is the true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God, and bringing salvation to man, which now is, by the mercy of God, revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed Evangel . . . And therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly all kinds of papistry . . even as they are now damned and confuted by the Word of God and Kirk of Scotland, but in special we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman anti-Christ . . with all his absolute necessity of Baptism . . . his dedicating of Kirks, Altars, Days . . . prayers for the dead."

"We promise and swear, that we shall, to the uttermost of our power, with our means and lives, stand to the defence of our dread Sovereign, the King's Majesty, his person and authority, in the defence and preservation of the foresaid true religion, liberties, and laws of the Kingdom . . ."

Chapter II

EDINBURGH INTRODUCES AND EPITOMISES

I

In Scotland's capital there started that revolution which completely overthrew Scotland's corrupted Catholic Church, and with her that material beauty in which Catholicism always expresses itself. From that ancient citadel there afterwards went out into the Lowlands and then further afield, those astonishing manifestations of a perverted Christianity which created, and for centuries was to keep alive, hatred, intolerance, and persecution, as the covenanted trinity of virtues.

To the birthplace of Scotland's Judaised Christianity, let us go then, in the first instance, to watch the progress of that cruel system imported from Geneva which plunged Scotland into a long succession of tumults, strife, and slaughter. But before calling up from the past a succession of historical episodes, let us notice some points that have been generally suppressed in the character of the protagonist in the struggle, and of the personality of that redoubtable opponent whose very name finds no place in popular "history".

The Earl of Morton said over the grave of John Knox: "Here lies the one who never feared the face of man." Yet in 1554 he had fled from Scotland to France, and could never be induced to "stand up"

to his most formidable challenger, Ninian Winzet. Of John Knox, the revolutionary, a historian writes: " The faults of his ministry were due to his acceptance of the principle of persecution, to his constant misapplication of the Old Testament, and to his use of the pulpit as a political platform. These roots of bitterness remained in the soil of Scotland, and they yielded an abundant harvest: mainly to Knox we are indebted for one hundred and thirty years of strife, confusion, and proof texts."

In his " Appellation " from the sentence pronounced against him by the bishops and clergy addressed to the Nobility and Estates of Scotland, Knox's cruel temperament and ferocity that were to inspire so many future generations of Presbyterians, are well seen. He quotes Deut. xiii. 6-9, in support of his contention that it was the duty of Protestants as a body to exterminate as " idolaters ", all Catholics, including infants and children and other innocent persons. Knox's "Appellation " is a truly terrible letter, and in view of its complete negation of Christianity, blasphemously concludes with a prayer that the Holy Ghost might rule the hearts of its readers and the spirit of Jesus Christ guide them to the end. Indeed, the god of Knox—as of all who followed after him—is a horrible travesty of the true God; a bloody, inexorable, immoral tyrant in the contemplation of whom Knox over and over again exults, as he gleefully delights in dwelling on cruelty and every barbarity.

It is ever the arm of the flesh to which Knox appeals. Characteristically, he makes his first public

appearance in Scotland bearing a sword before Wishart, the Protestant martyr; and in the true succession of Knox, Presbyterianism, as will be seen, has continuously relied on the sword and the power of the sword to hack its way through to supremacy over those opposed to its system.

After the traits in his character displayed in his "Appellation" Knox's "reckless arrogance", vanity, ungovernable temper, and the insolence and rudeness that so usually distinguished his controversies with Queen Mary and others, seem of no account. Knox's apologists invariably excuse such faults as these—when others have rescued them from suppression—as merely the "faults of his age". But when they are confronted by the resurrected figure of one of the noblest of Knox's contemporaries in Scotland, even that excuse is taken from them. For this reason, and the even more potent one that this man proved too much for Knox, who could not browbeat him, but was by him reduced to silence, Master Ninian Winzet has been kept in hiding. Not till an Episcopalian, Andrew Lang, produced him, has he occupied his rightful place in the history of the so-called Reformation in Scotland. Still, however, he is kept out of the pages of such a standard book as Professor Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*, from which the youth and teachers of Scotland learn their untruthful history. Yet regarding the character of the erudite schoolmaster of Linlithgow and Provost of its Collegiate Church, there is no dispute. Of the few who have yet mentioned this fearless and persistent champion

of the Catholic faith, all are agreed that he was a good Christian man, earnest, courteous, and charitable in controversy, as indeed, his writings abundantly prove.

It was in the summer of 1561 that Winzet, to modernize his own words, was " at the command of . . . (the) preacher in Linlithgow, and of his superintendent . . . for refusing only to subscribe their fantasy and faction of faith, expelled and shot out of that my kindly town." He sought refuge in Edinburgh, but he had not been there a year when he narrowly escaped capture by the magistrates when he was superintending the printing of his *Last Blast on the Trumpet of God's Word.* Thus Belgium gained what Scotland lost, one who " illustrated in himself the prestige and honour which the Scottish Catholic clergy had in their best days of missionary spirit and learning ".

But in the next year, from Antwerp, Winzet issued his *Book of Four Score and Three Questions,* which was practically a rejoinder, amply supported by references to the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, to Knox's *Confession of Faith.* Once again Knox is posed with the question of the second Tractate regarding his call to the ministry, which question, though thrice pressed by letters, he had left unanswered.

" Since ye renounce (and that to your great shame, brother) and esteem that ordination null or rather wicked by the which sometime ye were called Sir [1] John," whence came his authority to minister,

[1] The old style for a priest without a master's degree.

Winzet pressed him to answer in writing. From the pulpit Knox had apparently repeatedly reiterated the assertion that he was " extraordinarily called " like John Baptist, for Winzet complains in one letter to Knox that " ye have harped so long on that string. Therefore if you, John Knox, we say, be called immediately by God, where are your marvels wrought by the Holy Ghost? For your marvels of overturning of realms to ungodly sedition and discord we reckon not to be of His gifts." The comment of another contemporary writer on John Knox's claim to be called like John Baptist was that " privately he shew himself to be so called in another manner, that is, by guns and pistols."

Winzet also championed his Sovereign against the attacks of Knox who fiercely inveighed against the " Monstrous Regiment [Government] of Women ". He pertinently asked "where mention is made in the Scripture that woman may not have dominion above man, is not that meant only of a married woman and her husband ", adding with gentle irony, " except ye will every lady in the land be subject to her own cook or houseboy?"

In Ninian Winzet we see the true type of reformer as opposed to the false, exemplified by John Knox, the revolutionary. No one deplored the sins of the Church and the scandal of an ignorant and immoral clergy, nor denounced them, and the greed and godlessness of nobles and people alike as effectively as this sincere Churchman. He indicated the better way in the eighty-first of his " Questions" addressed to the " Calvinian preachers ". " If ye allege in the

former order [of things in the Church], abuse, and superstition through ignorance to have abounded (which things we excuse not) why tramp ye not these abuses underfoot and set up that godly order to your own sincere purity? " And again, in another question: " Why have ye shorn away in this matter the wheat together with the vetches [tares]? "

Here we take leave of Ninian Winzet. " He was a formidable critic, all the more formidable because his language was moderate and reasonable. His social qualities were attractive: his accomplishments many. . . . He was an honest man, a frank friend, and independent thinker."

II

Before visiting St. Giles', which is in Presbyterian hands, there are some things which should be remembered. (1) All Presbyterians still do lip service to John Knox who " had but to preach, surrounded by his powerful patrons, and his words were like sledge-hammers, beating down abbeys, images, and altars ". He, too, with others was responsible for the abolition in Scotland of Christmas and all other Holy Days of the Christian Year. (2) Presbyterians generally still continue to laud the Covenanters, though they have long ago departed from everything for which the Covenanters fought and died. (Incidentally, this is no obstacle to Presbyterian commemorations of their conventicles, by celebrating these yearly out of doors in honour of the Covenanters.)

Arriving at the North door of the Old High Kirk of Edinburgh, the notice-board announces "St. Giles' Cathedral" (besides making mention of services at Christmas and Easter). Now, there was no *cathedra*, or seat of a bishop, in Edinburgh before September 29th, 1633, when King Charles the First granted a charter creating the See of Edinburgh, at the same time raising the burgh to the rank of a city. Charles the First and all his works are, of course, especially anathema to Presbyterians, but once again, their facility in having things both ways comes in when it is a case of being "upsides with" Episcopalians. Thus Presbyterians find no difficulty in shutting their eyes to the founder of the bishopric; and ignoring the signification of the word "Cathedral". This assumption of an empty style, however, has had awkward consequences.

On September 29th, 1933, there was due to be celebrated the tercentenary of the foundation of the See of Edinburgh, and the elevation of the Capital to City rank by a Charter of Charles I. A London paper, under the headings of "City forgets Tercentenary" and "Edinburgh's Lapse", thus wrote: "Edinburgh, which has a genius for public ceremony and pageantry, showed a singular lack of foresight in completely neglecting the tercentenary which occurred yesterday."

But this was not owing to any "singular lack of foresight". It was just the usual suppression by a dominating Presbyterianism of a fact and situation which would have dealt a blow at its prestige and pretensions. Had the advance of Edinburgh to civic

rank been associated with some honour conferred on Presbyterianism, it is safe to say there would have been no lack of celebration to commemorate these events—especially the latter. But as things are, it is obvious that had there been any civic commemoration of the Carolean Charter, the celebrations must of necessity, have centred in St. Mary's Cathedral (in the west end of Edinburgh) as now the true *cathedra*, or seat of the bishopric founded by King Charles. Thus not only would the present Establishment, by the very nature of the tercentenary, have had no part at all in the Cathedral celebrations, but in the course of the many questions which would necessarily have arisen, the horrid fact that St. Giles' is now only a mock cathedral would have received the widest publicity.

Since this was written, all that has been said above has been fully justified by a later event. On October 28th, 1933, there occurred the 350th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Edinburgh. Though the 350th is not a usual anniversary to single out for special observance, there was no "lapse" on this occasion. On the contrary, the proceedings were actually broadcasted in the National programme, and, with the exception of a fifteen minutes' address by Sir James Barrie, as the Chancellor, consisted of a three-quarters of an hour commemoration service in St. Giles' Cathedral!

What accounted for this strange celebration? The University of Edinburgh "has some pretension to claim John Knox as the man whose personal influence had most to do with her creation" Here then,

was a Presbyterian anniversary, heaven sent, to set off against and, if possible, to overshadow the greater one associated with Episcopacy. More specially was there need of it, as when the foundation of the See of Edinburgh was celebrated at St. Mary's Cathedral only the week previously, a week-night service had been attended by the Lord Provost and Magistrates. It was certainly desirable therefore, that the memory of this embarrassing episode should be wiped out.

As a feather shows how the wind blows, so the absence of a statue shows how Edinburgh's ecclesiastical history is more permanently suppressed in the interests of Presbytery. Over the modern west doorway of St. Giles' are niches containing statues of monarchs and ecclesiastics connected with the Church. Although the first Bishop, William Forbes, is represented, there is actually no place for King Charles the First, but for whose Charter the very style of "Cathedral" could not be vaunted on the building to-day.

Before entering St. Giles', it is very instructive to walk further up the street to the end of the Lawnmarket in order to see a building which still retains the features typical of a genuine Presbyterian interior. This will be found in the old Assembly Hall of the Scottish Establishment which was, and is, also occupied by the congregation of the Tolbooth Parish. Visitors are free to walk through the long passage on the ground floor and to ascend the steps into the old Assembly Hall. This is dominated by a vast pulpit, behind which rises an organ—unknown

to Presbyterianism before 1850. In front of, and beneath the pulpit, stands a small Communion table, quite bare, and on three sides round it are ranged seats for the choir, who, if the old custom be followed, turn round and face the congregation when they lead the singing. For the administration of baptism there is an iron ring on one side of the pulpit into which a basin can be fitted when required. The whole interior is as dingy and depressing as any could well be, and after this survey, a return should be made to St. Giles'.

Within the old Church the difference between it and the interior of the Tolbooth Church is startling. The " sturdy independence " of Presbyterianism is at once obvious in the approximation of the interior, as far as it dare go, to the appearance of an Anglican Cathedral, for which, indeed, it is often mistaken. (How to reconcile the satisfaction this causes to " High " Presbyterians with their boast of being in all things purely Scottish, is, like many another Presbyterian puzzle, left unanswered.) Not only is there an " altar " in the Church, but one in the Moray aisle, and yet a third in the " Shrine of Youth "—an unfilial imitation of a purely Anglican idea. And if the season be Lent or Advent, these two smaller " altars " will be vested in purple, the colour also of the gowns in which the men and women of the choir are always robed. No longer would the Father of Presbyterianism have required to go so far afield as London to put the question he did at the conclusion of some verses he wrote after a visit to the Chapel Royal, Hampton Court. Could

Andrew Melville but stand in St. Giles' to-day, he might ask of pseudo-Presbyterianism:

> "Doth she, with chapel put in Romish dress,
> The purple whore religiously express?"

III

Now we go back to the middle of the sixteenth century. "St. Giles' was the headquarters of the Reformation and within a few months after that great event, the interior of the Church was entirely cleared of altars, pictures, images, and other evidences of the old faith. . . . Within St. Giles' nothing survived except the bare walls." Even the old name had been cast away, and everything had been done to transform the beautiful old house of prayer into several barren places of preaching. For walls and the blocking up of the arches with wood made the material divisions which, later on, were to become so typical, in another form, of the new body for the use of which these partitions were made. John Knox became the minister of the "Great" Kirk, as the largest division was called. The whole building was "filthy and ill-kept": each division was furnished with a dominant pulpit, a mean table beneath for the Communion, and a few seats.

On Sunday, August 19th, 1565, in the midst of a large congregation in the Great Kirk, some on stools, but the larger part standing, Lord Darnley, the Queen's Consort, sat on a throne under a velvet canopy. The preliminaries of lengthy prayer and scant praise, in accordance with Knox's own Gene-

van " Forme " (later called the " Psalm Book "), had been finished, and the main feature, without which no service, for whatever purpose, was valid, was reached. The sermon which Knox, in his black Genevan gown with fur collar, then preached, is the only one of his that has been preserved. His text was: " O Lord our God other lords than Thou have ruled over us ". The claim of the Scottish revolutionaries to have a new revelation of the Evangel to replace the idolatry and corruption of the Church's teaching, was, however, clearly a vain boast. With violent gesticulations, Knox thundered forth in violent language, literally for hours. It was a noisy, tedious harangue on the wicked princes of the Old Testament and a sustained attack on Ahab and Jezebel, obviously aimed at the Queen and her Consort. It was a purely political discourse, at the end of which the infuriated Lord Darnley pushed his way out of the congregation in an ungovernable rage—to spend the rest of the day hawking. . . .

We overleap the years till 1637, when, following the creation of the Diocese of Edinburgh, St. Giles', by royal injunction, had been restored as much as could be to its former glory. The hideous partitions had been removed, and at the magistrates' request, the Dean, Hannay, had been to Durham, to see how a Cathedral should be fitted up. Two of the Scottish bishops, Maxwell and Ross, prepared a Service Book to replace the Genevan " Forme " or " Book of Common Order ", seeking from Archbishop Laud (who was in favour of the adoption of the English Prayer Book) suggestions and revision.

The day appointed, July 23rd, arrived for its arbitrary introduction throughout Scotland. It was the seventh Sunday after Trinity, and there was great excitement in St. Giles', for the populace had been stirred up to make an organized riot in the Cathedral. As was the custom in the seatless church, fashionable ladies had sent their deputies in advance, with "cutty" or "creepie" stools, to secure, and keep, good places for their mistresses through the prayers and Scripture reading, which were the common unconsidered prelude to the usual preaching. But this time the place of sewing-maids was largely taken by prentices in disguise, eager for the pre-arranged brawl.

Excitement increased as the hour of ten drew near and the reader of the Genevan prayers, Mr. Henderson, took a tearful farewell of the people. Then entered the Bishop of Edinburgh, followed by the Dean, who went to the reading desk to begin prayers. This was the signal for the beginning of the disturbance, and there were cries of "False anti-Christian! ", "beastly belly god! ", "crafty fox!", "ill-hanged thief!", and "Judas!" The Bishop asked the congregation for silence to allow the service to proceed, and told the Dean below him to read the collect for the day. Before he could begin, up jumped a woman, Barbara Hamilton, wife of John Mein, an elder, and a merchant who was distinguished for selling goods on Christmas and other holy days. This lady led the volley of stools and bibles by flinging her own stool at the head of the Dean, after bawling: "De'il colic the wame

[stomach] of thee: out thou false thief! Dost thou say Mass at my lug?" Then getting up from her stool, she hurled it at the Dean's head, an example of piety promptly followed by others. So riotous did they become, that the Bishop had at last to appeal to the magistrates, who cleared the church so that the service might be finished.

Such is the historic scene that constitutes one of Presbytery's proud records, and illustrates one facet of the character of its "native Scottish independence". But Presbytery's independence of truth is much more striking, for even within these sacred precincts it does not scruple to perpetuate untruths. For, on the handboard guide, to be picked up in the Moray aisle, there is, in the account of the events of 1637, reference to the new "service book sent down from England". And on a tablet by a gate entering the same aisle is the inscription: "Constant oral tradition affirms that near this spot a brave Scottish woman, Janet Geddes, on the 23rd July, 1637, struck the first blow in the great struggle for freedom of conscience which after a conflict of half a century ended in the establishment of civil and religious liberty".

So fiction is enshrined. In actual fact Jenny Geddes appears only in a pamphlet: "Edinburgh's Joy for His Majestie's Coronation in England", and refers to a woman who burnt the contents of her booth in honour of the Restoration. Thus, typically, is "constant oral tradition" preferred to "historic fact" by Presbyterians; and as for the "establishment of civil and religious liberty", alleged to have

been secured in 1689, when Presbytery triumphed, its curious nature will in due course be demonstrated.

In the meantime, another incident associated with St. Giles' will serve to foreshadow "religious liberty" as understood by Presbyterians. In the very place where Charles the First's arbitrary introduction of a Scottish service book had been so resented, that poor king, during his second visit to Edinburgh in 1641, was forced to conform "himself to Presbyterian requirements" and to attend St. Giles' twice daily. And "on two Sundays the King came to St. Giles', and in the forenoon when"—actually a Presbyterian minister—"stood behind the throne, probably to see that he comported himself with proper solemnity."

In the Scottish Antiquarian Museum, the folding stool of "Jenny Geddes", probably as authentic as herself, may still be seen for the veneration of those who regard her as a heroine. St. Giles' to-day commemorates her pious memory by the regular use of "colics" and other prayers ("improved" by alteration and expansion) from the Book of Common Prayer—of the Church of England, the true Prayer Book of Laud. For one cannot suppose that the "sturdy Scottish independence" of the ministers would ever allow them to use the Scottish Prayer Book—any more than St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, was visited to see how to fit up St. Giles', and how to conduct "our simple Scottish service" as closely as possible on Anglican lines—even to the introduction of a verger with his mace.

This time a journey to some English Cathedral further south than Durham was probably made.

Symbolical of this betrayal of John Knox in the very building where he himself ministered, is the treading underfoot of his grave on the south side of St. Giles' outside. True, this is the unconscious act of passers by, since the grave of Presbytery's hero is merely marked by an insignificant metal square, suggestive of the cover of a hydrant, and simply inscribed " I.K., 1572 ". Now, since St. Giles' is no longer as the stern revolutionary left it, and therefore *si monumentum requiris, circumspice,* cannot, as previously, apply, a statue of Knox was, in 1906, set up inside.

In the south-west corner of Parliament Square, just a few steps across from St. Giles', is the Parliament House, in the Hall of which the unconstitutional and revolutionary Convention-Parliament of 1689 sat. A separate chapter is necessary to tell the story and the outcome of its proceedings, which resulted, locally, in the old congregation of St. Giles' being turned adrift—to be replaced by the adherents of a politically triumphant Presbyterianism. But while we are in Scotland's capital, it will add interest to our tour of old Edinburgh to hear on the spot of the important place which force of arms then took, as always, in the history of Scottish Presbyterianism.

In 1688 Leven's, or the Edinburgh Regiment, was raised by the Earl of Leven, and in April 1689 the regiment, largely recruited from Galloway and Ayr, where Covenanters prevailed, was brought into the capital. There they stood in the streets and were

posted round the Parliament House to intimidate from entering what Bishops and Royalists they could. For this reason, and to this day, in commemoration of the event the same regiment, now the King's Own Scottish Borderers, march with fixed bayonets and flying colours when passing through, or paraded in, the City.

IV

There is a delightful book called *The Romance of the Edinburgh Streets* which include Carrubers Close, off the top of the High Street and on its north side. Two-thirds of a page is devoted to the history of the Close, yet not a single reference is made to the greatest of all its romances which is associated with Old St. Paul's. Nor is Old St. Paul's even mentioned. The reason is, of course, that it enshrines an outstanding incident in Scotland's suppressed history.

Carrubers Close is a dark narrow entry, the first on the left-hand side of the High Street after turning into it from the North Bridge. Quite recently, an oak notice board has been affixed to the wall on the right hand side of the entry. It reads as follows:

Old St. Paul's Church

EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

FOUNDED BY ALEXANDER ROSE, BISHOP OF EDINBURGH, AND HIS FLOCK, AFTER THEIR EXPULSION FROM ST. GILES' CATHEDRAL IN 1689. THE ORIGINAL BUILDING WAS A WOOLSTORE, WHICH HAS BEEN REPLACED

BIT BY BIT SINCE THAT DATE BY THE PRESENT BUILDING.
WITHIN THE CHURCH WILL BE FOUND THE SEABURY CHAPEL, BUILT TO COMMEMORATE BISHOP SAMUEL SEABURY,[1] FIRST BISHOP OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH, WHO WORSHIPPED HERE DURING HIS RESIDENCE IN EDINBURGH AS A STUDENT OF MEDICINE.

THE WARRIORS' CHAPEL (CHAPEL OF THE CRUCIFIXION) BUILT TO COMMEMORATE ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN THE GREAT WAR.

The church is perhaps best known as the stronghold of the Jacobite cause in the City during the eighteenth century. Its members were closely associated with Prince Charles Edward Stuart, and suffered accordingly, especially in the '45.

Though known to few outside Edinburgh Episcopalians, there is no modern building in Edinburgh, excepting only the National War Memorial, of greater interest, for it may be called the apotheosis of Scotland's suppressed history. There is neither record nor legend invented—after Presbyterian example—regarding the scene that took place when in 1689 Bishop Rose and his people were driven out of St. Giles'. But the large building itself is full of interesting and some unusual features—notably the bronze Roman lamps on the walls of the beautiful and original Warriors' Chapel.

Of course, as now in most Scottish Episcopal Churches, the Scottish Prayer Book is used in Old St. Paul's. The services, always well attended by

[1] See pp. 337–9.

all classes of people from the very poor to the well-to-do, are rendered with a dignity and reverence that cannot fail to impress: the music [1] and the singing, led by a remarkably large male choir, are in keeping. In the humble predecessors of the present church, there worshipped amongst others, Thomas Ruddiman, the famous grammarian, Sir Robert Strange, the celebrated engraver; William Ged, the inventor of stereotyping; and Sir John Leslie, the philosopher. Besides these came Sir Stuart Threipland, Prince Charlie's secretary; W. E. Aytoun, author of *Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers*; and the Baroness Nairne, the Scottish ballad-writer.

Most of the Scottish Episcopal Church's old shrines were burnt down by Cumberland. Of those remaining few are more hallowed by their memories of a heroic past than Old St. Paul's. One can feel this historic Church alive and throbbing with the spirit of those who surrendered St. Giles' rather than their faith, and were then forced to worship, like their successors for many years, in an old wool store. "All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me," said the devil to the Son of God. In like fashion William of Orange offered power and position to Bishop Rose of Edinburgh,[2] saying in effect "Establishment by Act of Parliament and all that it connotes will I continue to your Church if you will but forswear James to own

[1] The first organ after the Revolution was erected in Old St. Paul's, in May, 1782.

[2] See p. 239.

me as King." But the Bishop preferred principle to expediency and state power. So he and the Faithful renounced the proffered political favour and went into the wilderness, thenceforth to be despised and rejected of men even as their Master.

V

Up towards the Castle we go now, to find, off George IV Bridge, Greyfriars. Here, in 1638, was signed the first of some dozen copies of that National Covenant which, with its successors, was to become the curse of the cause of Christianity in Scotland. It was in the newly restored eastern part of the building, originating in 1613, and not in the graveyard, as commonly stated, that the Covenant was actually signed, Montrose—to the last, a staunch Presbyterian—being amongst the signatories.

As this is written, the service of the "re-dedication" of Old Greyfriars, as the eastern part is called, has just taken place, and well illustrates the mere lip-service which, despite fulsome adulations, is all that the Covenanters now receive from those who uphold them—in all but example. For in the National Covenant itself is this condemnation: "in special we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman anti-Christ . . . . *his dedicating of Kirks, Altars, Days*"! [1]

Nine years later came the "Directory of Public Worship." The Church of Scotland's "system and principles of worship" are declared to be in accord-

[1] See p. 55.

ance with this book, in Schedule II of the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, which, however, provides for its possible modification. Perhaps then, in honour of the Covenanters and the National Covenant, the Directory's statement that "*no place is capable of any holiness, under pretence of whatsoever dedication or consecration*" has been deleted by some act of the General Assembly.

Pledged as the Covenanters were, however, to the "extirpation of Popery and Prelacy" alike, anyone except the "High" Presbyterians of to-day would suppose that the imitations of "Prelatic" use and wont (sadly lacking the prelate, but copied, nevertheless, from the Church of England), would be an insult to the Covenanters' memory. In those days, too, the Moderator was plain "Mr."—he had not then blossomed out into "Right Reverend"—like "the black prelates of that old strumpet-mother Episcopacy"—to use the elegant Covenanting description of bishops. Nor was the Moderator then decked out in lace ruffles and court dress—this no following of Canterbury, but the badge of that Erastianism against which the Covenanters fought, yet which was joyfully embraced by Presbytery in 1689.

Then whence came the sashes and the scarf embroidered with crosses worn by the minister of Greyfriars at the service of "re-dedication", but from the legitimate successors of the despised and "unlettered" curates, whose robes the Covenanters so delighted to destroy when they rabbled their wearers? Had there been any Covenanting ghosts

haunting Greyfriars then, and could they but have spoken, they might have varied the Moderator's text by asking, in reference to the alleged commemoration of themselves, "What mean ye by this mockery?"

In the west, or New Greyfriars, however, we shall at least find a building free of "prelatical" furnishings, and consequently more in consonance with the Covenanting and Presbyterian tradition. There is a characteristic and interesting relic in the glass case in the lobby—the sword carried by the Rev. Robert Traill, A.M., Greyfriars minister from 1648 to 1662, and one of the chaplains to the Scots Army at Marston Moor in 1644. There is a portrait in the same case showing a man with a grim, merciless face, hard lines and cruel eyes. This, however, is not as might be supposed, a representation of "Bluidy Clavers", but of the godly and pious Mr. Traill.

In one corner of the churchyard there is the place, where for lack of any building big enough, the great number of Covenanters captured at Bothwell Bridge were imprisoned. Their sufferings here, together with those of others imprisoned on the Bass Rock and at Dunottar are well-worn parts of the incessantly repeated story of the Covenanters. In these cases the sad tale is too true, but what of the prisoners taken and kept in long and noisome durance by the Covenanters? How did they fare?

We read much of the wicked, blood-thirsty and tyrannical conduct of the bishops and curates alike, but it is significant that, as far as the writer has been

able to discover, with the exception of Archbishop Sharp,[1] no authentic charge is brought against any single bishop or curate, and, of course, the reckless wholesale charges are without any substantiation. On the other hand, in 1644 George Wishart, subsequently Bishop of Edinburgh, was thrown into the Thieves' Hole of the Tolbooth Prison by the Covenanters, who at the same time plundered his house and turned his wife and children adrift. To his dying day Bishop Wishart bore upon his face the marks where the rats had gnawed him when in the Thieves' Hole. But instead of seeking revenge upon the Covenanters when they were imprisoned for rebellion, the Bishop pleaded for them, and " mindful of his own sufferings ", he fed them daily from his own table. This, though it cannot claim to be " the triumph of Presbyterianism " was, at least, one of the rare Christ-like actions that emerge from the age of this internecine warfare dominated by hatred.

Montrose invariably treated his prisoners with clemency, and after his desertion of the Covenant, dismissed most of them when they promised on their honour never again to bear arms against the King. One of his first acts after his victory at Kilsyth in 1645 was to release numbers of Royalists who had endured every possible hardship during a year's close captivity.

Perhaps the greatest sufferer was Lord Ogilvie who, together with Ogilvy of Powrie, Irvine of

[1] Sharp, however, pleaded for the lives of two Covenanters, James Guthrie and Simpson, and though he failed in the first case, he succeeded in the second. See pp. 155, 180.

Drum, Reay, and the Earl of Crawford amongst others, was thrown into the Tolbooth, the common gaol, there to join Bishop Wishart and others. Lady Ogilvie sent a petition to Parliament on behalf of her husband, whose only crime was that he was a Royalist and friend of Montrose. She wrote: " His body is visibly decayed and pined away, and the strength thereof altogether abated, so that he is not able of himself to stand or walk. . . . The house from which he was furnished his meat and drink is infected [by the plague] . . . . and many times he will be forty-eight hours without so much as a cup of cold water." The response to this was an order for removal to the Bass Rock, but before this could be effected, Montrose's lieutenants came to his rescue.

After the rout of Philiphaugh the Covenanters had taken many prisoners—of course on promise of quarter—including some of Montrose's most intimate friends—Lord Ogilvie, Sir Robert Spottiswoode, Sir William Rollo, and Colonel Nathaniel Gordon. Taken to Glasgow, Covenanting justice was there meted out to them by a committee in which, naturally, ministers predominated over laymen, more disposed to be merciful. On the inexorable spirit of the ministers, Colonel Buchan, in his *Montrose* remarks: " Only by blood could the wrath of the strange deity they worshipped be appeased," and to that deity the blood-offering was duly made. On successive days Rollo, a lame man, Sir Philip Nisbet, and Ogilvy of Inverquharity, " a lovely young youth " in his teens, were beheaded at the Mercat Cross. The other two were to provide later, with

others, a Covenanting holiday. This was at St. Andrew's, whither, in fear of Montrose, the Covenanting Estates had withdrawn, having previously removed there all their more important prisoners. Once again arose the howl for blood, led by the pious Mr. Robert Blair in his opening sermon, perverting Holy Scripture to rouse in his hearers a desire for vengeance on their captives. Johnston of Warristoun, of whom more will appear later, admirably seconded the minister's efforts by urging the immediate execution of all the Royalist prisoners taken under promise of quarter.

"Four Petitions from the Kirk" drawn up by ministers, full of zeal for their office, set forth "how displeasing to the supreme Judge of the world, how grievous unto the hearts of the Lord's people the former delays" had been, and insisted that "the Lord called for blood at their hands". So the House, of course, ordained that "the Irish prisoners taken at and after Philiphaugh, in all the prisons of the kingdom, especially in the prisons of Selkirk, Jedburgh, Glasgow, Dumbarton and Perth" were "to be executed without any assize or process."

Nothing whatever is said by Covenanting writers about this, but nothing too much can be said by them when, under Charles II, the Cameronians, the extremest of all the fanatical Covenanters, were similarly treated.

Nor were all the prisoners Irish—if their nationality is held to justify their murders. Amongst them, however, were six poor women immured at Selkirk, but they were ordered to be put to death in cold blood if

they had been on the field—or in the rebellion. Colonel Nathaniel Gordon, Sir Robert Spottiswoode, Captain Andrew Guthrie, and William Murray, the 19-year-old brother of Covenanting Tullibardine—none of these were Irish. Yet after condemnation by a self-appointed Committee, they were all beheaded by the " Maiden " at St. Andrew's Cross, like all the previous victims of the Covenanters, for the sole crime of fighting for their King against them.

Of these Sir Robert Spottiswoode was an old man, and a non-combatant, of blameless life, who had surrendered to his predecessor in office on promise of quarter. " While the Government still kept up a pretence of royalism and legality, his execution was plain murder," said Buchan, and further, regarding his farewell letter to Montrose, that it " breathes a spirit of Christian forbearance unhappily lacking in those who had the name of religion always on their lips." Sir Robert wrote, " I most humbly recommend . . . . you will continue by fair and gentle carriage to win the people's affection for their prince, rather than to imitate the barbarous inhumanity of your adversaries." Of course the advice was followed, and the Covenanters imprisoned in Blair Castle suffered no reprisals—as they would have done had the example of the " consistent deadly barbarity of the Kirk and the Estates " been followed.

The " Martyrs' Monument " is to be found in an opposite quarter to that of the Covenanters' prison. The doggerel upon it is common to unnumbered inscriptions of the same century—it was erected in 1771—and indeed for more than a century later. The

complete untruthfulness of many of its statements is peculiar to the Covenanters and their " historians."

Where in the whole length and breadth of the Lowlands is there to be found a single monument erected to the memory of those, including so many innocents who, as we have already seen, and shall continue to see, fell a prey to the ferocious blood lust of the Covenanters, who would tolerate nothing except their own intolerance? There is, indeed, about three miles out of St. Andrew's, on Magus Moor, a cairn erected on the spot where Archbishop Sharp was butchered in the arms of his daughter by a party of Covenanters. And in St. Giles' there is now a noble monument to the Great Marquis—a Presbyterian to the end, however—but of those equally worthy to be commemorated, there is no memorial. The intolerant spirit of the Covenanters, which still animates Presbyterianism, would never allow its erection, though the inscription were confined to a plain statement of authentic facts. Yet such a memorial should be raised up, as an act of reparation and of common justice, on some prominent site in the Capital there to be seen of all men.

This is suggested:

ERECTED IN REVERENT MEMORY

OF GORDON OF HADDO, "THROUGH THE MALICE OF THE KIRK"—CAPT. LOGIE, AND MAXWELL OF LOGAN, EXECUTED AT EDINBURGH CROSS, BECAUSE THEY HAD FOUGHT FOR THE KING, JUNE, 1644.

OF THE YOUTHFUL JAMES GORDON OF RYNIE, MURDERED BY TWO OF HURRY'S LIEUTENANTS WHEN LYING WOUNDED IN A COTTAGE, MAY, 1645.

EDINBURGH INTRODUCES AND EPITOMISES

Of the Irish women and their babes; butchered in cold blood, in the Wood of Methven, Perthshire, July, 1645.

Of the 50 or more Ulstermen, some slaughtered on the field of Philiphaugh, Selkirkshire, Sept., 1645—others shot in cold blood next day in the courtyard of Newark Castle near by—all after quarter given. [p. 85]

Of the 300 Irish women and children and the 200 camp followers, all massacred on the field of Philiphaugh. [p. 86]

Of those 80 men, women and children drowned with great cruelty, "without sentence or the least formality of law," at the Bridge over the Avon near Linlithgow, Sept., 1645 [pp. 86-7]

Of two Irish officers, O'Cahan and Lachlan, who, after surrendering at Philiphaugh on promise of quarter, were hanged on the Castle Hill, Edinburgh, without trial, Oct., 1645 [p. 86]

Of those in the prisons of Selkirk, Jedburgh, Glasgow, Dumbarton and Perth and other places, executed "without any assize or sentence", after Philiphaugh. [p. 80]

Of the three gallant cavaliers, Sir William Rollo, Sir Philip Nisbet, and Alex Ogilvy of Inverquharity, beheaded at the earnest solicitation of the Commissioners of the Kirk, at the Mercat Cross, Glasgow, Oct., 1645. [see p. 79]

Of the three Royalist gentlemen, Colonel Nathaniel Gordon, Sir Robert Spottiswoode, a non-combatant, and William Murray, aged 19, beheaded at the Cross of St. Andrew's, Jan., 1646. [p. 81]

Of the 259 defenceless Macdonalds and Macdougals, butchered at the instigation of the Rev. John Nevay (part-author and reviser of the Metrical Psalms,) at Dunaverty Castle, Kintyre, May, 1647. [pp. 111-13]

OF THE MARQUIS OF HUNTLY, AFTER A YEAR'S IMPRISONMENT FOR RISING FOR THE KING, BEHEADED MAR. 23, 1649. [p. 142]

OF THE YOUNG TRUMPETER TAKEN PRISONER WHO HAD HIS BRAINS BLOWN OUT BY HAMILTON AFTER THE BATTLE OF DRUMCLOG, 1679. [see p. 114]

OF CAPT. WALLACE'S MEN AT THE SACK OF HOLYROOD, SOME KILLED ON SURRENDER, OTHERS LEFT TO DIE IN PRISON OF WOUNDS AND STARVATION. DEC. 10, 1688.

OF ALL THOSE CLERGY—"THE CURATES"—OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND WHO WERE RABBLED AND MURDERED, OR DIED FROM ILL-TREATMENT, 1688-89. [pp. 103, 193]

AND OF ALL OTHERS WHO SUFFERED IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH FOR THE SUPREME CRIME OF WITHSTANDING THE COVENANTS.

THE ABOVE DEEDS WERE ALL INSTIGATED AND ENCOURAGED BY THE COVENANTING MINISTERS

Speaking at Perth on September 20th, 1933, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Scottish Establishment is reported to have said to the people he was addressing: "They must cultivate the spirit of liberty, the liberty for which the Covenanters stood." Even so far, this book will have demonstrated the fact that "the spirit of liberty" is one thing, and "the liberty for which the Covenanters stood" quite another—liberty for themselves alone. But to restrict oneself to true liberty—that toleration which is liberty all round—will Dr. Lachlan MacLean Watt himself give an example of upholding it by pledging his support to any responsible effort to commemorate Covenanting victims in the manner suggested? His answer will show his sincerity in the plea he made at Perth.

VI

After visiting Greyfriars it is illuminating to set out to see something of the way in which the Covenanters did cultivate " the spirit of liberty ".

Selkirk is only a short run south of Edinburgh—forty miles by rail, and three miles from Selkirk on the favourite run to St. Mary's Loch, is the flat land, or " haugh ", where was fought the battle of Philiphaugh. Here in 1645 the Covenanters under Leslie defeated the Royalists led by Montrose. Fifty or more Royalists, headed by Adjutant Stewart laid down their arms when Leslie promised them quarter, and thereupon they left their entrenchment for the open field. But the ministers of the Covenanters, who were always at hand to hound on their followers from one butchery to another, intervened. They were furious " that such quarter should be given to such wretches, and declared it to be an act of sinful impiety to spare them." Argyll, one of the great " saints " of the Covenant, and other leaders were with Leslie, but there is no record of their insisting on the quarter given being honoured. In any case it was dishonoured. " The dishonouring of paroles and promises of quarter seems to have been the official creed of the Covenant ". So, encouraged by the ministers, the Covenanting wolves were let loose upon the fifty or so defenceless Ulstermen, of whom some were hacked to death on the field, and the rest shot next morning in the courtyard of Newark Castle, two miles farther up the Yarrow. Stewart himself and his two

officers, O'Cahan and Lachlan, were not included in this massacre. The former, however, only escaped the gallows by getting away, but later his officers were hanged in Edinburgh without any trial, their only crime that of fulfilling their duty by fighting for their King.

But this was not the only Covenanting atrocity at Philiphaugh. "On the day of the battle . . . 300 Irishwomen, with their children, were butchered on the field. . . . The cooks and horseboys also perished to the number of some 200." "This must have been done with the concurrence of Argyll and the Council of War. . . . They watched the conflict throughout. . . ." for "the Lord hath this day, here at Philiphaugh, near Selkirk, appeared gloriously to His people."

These poor innocent victims of the saints of "Covenanted Scotland" were buried in the field near the Castle still known as "Slain Man's Lee", and a small obelisk on the battlefield commemorates—not *them*, of course, but the fallen comrades of their murderers.

On their triumphant march to Edinburgh, the eyes of the Covenanters were gladdened by the sight of yet more Royalists who had escaped from Philiphaugh, and had been captured probably by Covenanting soldiers scouring the hills for more victims. Just before Linlithgow (within twenty miles of Edinburgh,) was reached, these poor wretches were thrown from the bridge over the Avon. Eighty women and children "without sentence or the least formality of law" were thus treated. Some of the women had infants

at the breast, and when any of the victims managed to struggle out of the water, the Covenanters with ready pikes savagely drove them back till all were drowned. It is Buchan who states that these barbarities were " sanctioned and inspired by the Kirk ".

One David Dickson, Professor of the Divinity Chair at Glasgow, when he heard the grateful tidings, gleefully exclaimed : " The wark goes bonnily on !" So highly esteemed by the Covenanters was this gentle shepherd—" of warm gladsome, poetic nature, bubbling up with humour " and " a pastor of evangelical fervour "—that he was later transferred to the Divinity Chair at Edinburgh. He also was elected not only once, but twice to the Moderatorial Chair which Dr. Lachlan MacLean Watt recently occupied.

" On Dec. 5th the Commissioners of the Church presented a petition against mercy to the noblemen and gentlemen captured at Philiphaugh ", backed by similar petitions from the Synods of Merse and Teviotdale, Dumfries, Galloway, and Fife. On Jan. 2nd, 1646, the House expressed its gratitude to the Commissioners, and " for their satisfaction in so just and pious desires", assured them of its "faithful and best endeavours for executing justice upon delinquents ". The first draft of this reply had been read on December 26th; and on the 23rd the Parliament had ordered that all Irish captives still detained in various prisons should be executed without trial.

VII

It was at Linlithgow that, in 1662, the Covenant[1] was publicly burned—by no means a solitary instance—seemingly principally at the instigation of Mr. Ramsay (afterwards Bishop of Dunblane), and a Mr. Mylne, the Dean of Guild. Although afterwards in 1696, the council declared there was nothing in the minutes appointing the deed to be done, and declaring that the town had no hand in it, the fact remains, that the Covenant *was* burnt there, to celebrate May 29, Restoration Day.

A contemporary account shows that the proceedings admirably epitomized the case against the Covenant, so it is here transcribed: "At the Mercat Cross was erected a crown standing on one arch on four pillars. On one side of the arch was placed a statue in the form of an old hag, having the Covenant in her hands, with this superscription: 'A glorious reformation', and on the other side of the arch was placed another statue in the form of a Whiggamore [a Covenanter from the West], having the Remonstrance in his hand with this superscription. 'No association with malignants'; and on the other side was drawn a Committee of Estates, with this superscription, 'Ane act for delivering the King'; and on the left side was drawn a Commission of the Kirk, with this superscription, 'Ane act of the West Kirk'; and on the top of the arch stood the Devil as

[1] This would be the Solemn League and Covenant (see pp 132-4), an advance on the National Covenant (see p. 55)

an angel, with this label in his mouth, ' Stand to the cause '; and in the middle hung a table with this litany:

" From Covenanters with uplifted hands,
From remonstrators with associate bands,
From such Committees as govern'd the nation
From kirk-commissions and their protestation,
Good Lord, deliver us ".

" Over the pillar at the arch beneath the Covenant were drawn kirk-stools, rocks and reels . . . and on the back of the arch was drawn Rebellion in a religious habit; with turned up eyes, in her right hand *Lex Rex* [1] (of which and other obscurities above, more anon), in her left, a piece called ' The causes of God's wrath ", round about her was lying all Acts of Parliament, of Committees of Estates, of General Assemblies and of the Commissioners of the Kirk, with their protestations and declarations during the twenty-two years' Rebellion; above her was written: ' Rebellion " is as the sin of witchcraft '. At the drinking of His Majesty's health, fire was put to the frame, it turned into ashes, and there appeared suddenly a table supported by two angels, and on the other side the dragon, the devil that fought Michael the Archangel, with this inscription:

" Great Britain's monarch on this day was born
And to his kingdoms happily restor'd,
The queen's arriv'd the mitre now is worn,
Let us rejoice this day is from the Lord.
Fly hence, all traitors who did marr our peace;
Fly hence, schismatics who our Church did rent;
Fly, covenanting remonstrating race,
Let us rejoice that God this day hath sent ".

[1] See p 152.

A subsequent chapter will be devoted to giving some account, in proper sequence, of what it is necessary to say about the Covenants and the Covenanters further than those isolated incidents that have been already detailed.

VIII

Back in Edinburgh again, there is a final episode and its result to be narrated before taking leave of Scotland's Capital.

It is a case which illustrates to perfection that " liberty of conscience " which, since it had been won for Scotland by the Covenanters, was now so perfectly put into practice by the triumphant Presbyterians.

The Rev. James Greenshields, the son of a Scottish priest, had received Holy Orders from James Ramsay, Bishop of Ross. This bishop, like Mr. Greenshields, senior, had been deprived when, in 1689, the Scottish Episcopal Church had been disestablished. The younger Greenshields had served in Ireland for thirteen years, and returned to Scotland in 1709 with excellent credentials from two Irish bishops.

At the earnest request of some Edinburgh citizens, Greenshields (who had taken the oath of allegiance required of him) opened a place of worship, first in the Canongate, then in the High Street, and, there being no other at the time, had used the English Prayer Book.

Roused by this outrageous offence, the indignation of the Presbytery of Edinburgh knew no bounds—nor did their conception of the extent of their juris-

diction, for they actually summoned Mr. Greenshields to appear before them. This he did whilst denying their authority, which did not, however, prevent them from prohibiting his ministrations. To enforce their prohibition, this Erastian Court of an Erastian Establishment appealed to the Magistrates, who, complying, let Mr. Greenshields understand imprisonment was the alternative to disobedience. But next Sunday, as usual, Mr. Greenshields officiated, and then was cast into the common gaol.

After enduring prison for some time, Mr. Greenshields presented a " bill of suspension " to the Court of Session, pleading that both the Presbytery and the magistrates had acted without any lawful warrant. He claimed that he was as free to minister in Scotland as Scots Presbyterians were in Ireland, though there they had no legal toleration.

But the Lords of Session dismissed the bill on the ultra-Erastian ground, most gratifying to the Establishment, that Mr. Greenshields had not been validly ordained because *he had been ordained by a deprived bishop*![1] One of the learned judges declared that such a bishop "*had no more power to ordain than a ballad-crier in the streets*".

It was an Act of Parliament, not any ecclesiastical authority that had deprived the bishops, just as an Act of Parliament had set up the Presbyterian Establishment. Therefore it is evident that, in Presbyterian eyes a bishop ceases to be a bishop when the State deprives him of his see. But, of course, this runs clean counter to the doctrine of the Catholic

[1] See p. 319.

Church, which holds that Holy Orders are of an indelible *spiritual* character.

Yet again, here a miracle intervened to uphold Presbyterianism, so that the charge of inconsistency cannot be brought against it. For when Presbyterian ministers had been deprived in 1662, their often armed, and always public defiance of the law, is one of the most notorious facts in post-" Reformation " history. It is, of course, one of those many " glories " of Presbyterianism of which it is never tired of boasting, however tired others may be of hearing their wearisome reiteration. Despite Acts of Parliament, these " outed " gentlemen set the West of Scotland on fire with their rebellious preachings. Yet though, according to the records in the *Fasti*, many of them had *never been ordained at all*—merely " instituted ", and most, if not all had abjured the King—nevertheless, these must be held to have retained a valid ordination which they had received from no one whatsoever!

In view of the Presbyterian interpretation of " liberty of conscience ", it is little wonder that an English officer in Edinburgh wrote thus to a friend in London: " I have seen so much *violence* and *inveteracy* from the Presbyterian party here, against the Church of England, and the nation in general, *that it almost turns my stomach*. . . . Though a chaplain was here, yet he was *not suffered* to preach; which is what we were never denied in the most rigid Roman Catholic countries ".

Mr. Greenshields, however, was far from being subdued. He and his friends appealed to the British

House of Peers, and only then, after an imprisonment of seven months separating him from his wife and seven children, did the Edinburgh magistrates release him. Owing to changes in the Government, the decision of the Lords was not pronounced till March 1711, when it reversed the decree of the Court of Session, and gave Mr. Greenshields costs against the Edinburgh magistrates. No wonder the Presbyterians felt this was intolerable, but worse was yet to follow, for despite the stupendous efforts they made, in 1712 the Toleration Act was passed for the benefit of Scottish Episcopalians.

This chapter may most suitably be rung out by the bells of St. Mary's Cathedral which were inaugurated in 1879, the day before its consecration, upon which occasion they were first rung.

Now, bells are illegal both in Scotland and England except for the Established Church. The Church of England, however, making no boast of her toleration, has allowed this law to become a dead letter. As the most ancient institution in the land, her position needs no assertion. Not so with liberty-loving Presbyterianism. Hence the righteous wrath of the Presbyterian citizens of 1879 found expression in the pages of *The Scotsman*. Only two years ago there was a little recrudescence of the same spirit, for the same reason, over ringing the cathedral bell at 5 P.M. for evensong—when no one's slumbers could be disturbed.

Chapter III

GLASGOW CONTINUES THE EXPOSURE

I

Glasgow, now very poor in historic buildings, has her noblest monument of past ages in the old cathedral of St. Mungo,[1] now, like St. Giles', Edinburgh, in Presbyterian hands. It is well worth a visit, as much for the merits of its architecture as for its historic associations, some of which we shall attempt to visualize.

Though " purged " of all " monuments of idolatry " by the Knoxian revolutionaries, the building itself was saved from overthrow by the determined action of the City trades guilds. Later, however, the old Cathedral suffered the usual divisions of its fabric, but now appears, as regards that, more as it used to be, with even some " monuments of idolatry ", including stained glass windows replaced.

It was in the old Cathedral that there was held the General Assembly of 1610 [2] that restored the historic Episcopate to Scotland. James reprehensibly influenced the election of representatives to this Assembly,

[1] It is interesting to notice that in 1882 at a meeting of the Established Presbytery, a protest was made against Dr. Burns' style He was declared to be " the minister of the Inner High Church—not of the Cathedral, for there is no such Church in Glasgow [This being long before St. Mary's became a Cathedral] and Dr. Burns is only minister of the Inner Church."

[2] p 42.

but it was upon an indifferent rather than upon a reluctant people, that he pressed the real, as opposed to the previous mock, Episcopate. To the greedy and godless nobility who had battened on the spoils of the Church, the bishops became insupportable. For they were associated with the two commissions which the King had appointed to try those who were "scandalous in life or religion". Hence the ignoble nobility, as coming under this heading, lost no opportunity of fomenting enthusiasm for the Covenant, and took their revenge on the bishops—with interest—in 1638.

In preparation for this Assembly of 1638, held in the Choir (or High Church) of the Cathedral, the Tables [1] sent to Poland for arms. "A complete organization including clerks, couriers and spies, was set up and maintained by supporters of the Cause. Governmental movements were ferreted out and reported at headquarters: billets were fixed up for brethren already armed: two ships full of arms were on their way home from the Continent: everywhere was heard the preparation for all emergencies." "It was to be a muster in arms." Representatives were accompanied by "their armed body guards".

Every pains had, of course, been taken to ensure that no one who was "erroneous in doctrine or scandalous in life" should be "elected" to the Assembly. The mere fact that a man had refused to sign the Covenant made him at once both "scandalous in life" and "erroneous in doctrine". Every effort

[1] Four representative committees of peers, gentry, ministers, and burgesses, so called because they sat at as many separate tables in the Parliament House. They ultimately became the real rulers of Scotland.

was made to exclude anyone known to be favourable to Episcopacy. In such fashion, then, was this Assembly packed.

Similarly, some two hundred years later, the Vatican Council of 1870 was to be manipulated by those amongst his fellow Romanists, whom Cardinal Newman stigmatized as an " insolent and aggressive faction ". These were determined to make *de fide* the doctrine of Papal Infallibility which, before 1870, one of their own Catechisms [1] had stated was only " a Protestant invention ". By different methods but with the same object in view—the triumph of their own side—the Ultramontane Roman Catholics, like the Covenanters in 1638, set about the business. The rules of procedure were deliberately framed to give every advantage to the " insolent and aggressive faction " which was engineering the Council. The closure, after a short while, was freely used, and the greatest of the American prelates, Archbishop Kenrick, was amongst the victims. He could only publish his intended speech afterwards, as a protest against the irregularity of the whole proceedings. When the final closure came, forty-nine bishops were still on the list to speak. At the later stages, bishops were sometimes interrupted or howled down. The Decree passed with eighty-eight dissentient votes; the minority bishops then departed under protest, leaving only two to record by their adverse votes the conviction that " the Holy Ghost does not speak through a packed and intimidated assembly ".

[1] Keenan's *Penny Catechism*, in which the phrase was deleted most cunningly after the decree of the Council.

We may now return to the Glasgow Assembly and see how unfavourably its proceedings compare even with those of the above. The Choir of the Cathedral " had been comfortably furnished with tiers of seats. . . . The clerestory buzzed with the whispers of seated ladies, while the nave and crypts resounded with the clangour of men armed with guns and pistolets ". Baillie, the well known Covenanting minister, author of gossiping letters on this and other assemblies, wrote: " It is here alone where I think we may learn from Canterbury, yea from the Pope, yea from the Turks and Pagans, modesty and manners; at least their deep reverence for the house they call God's ceases not till it have led them to the adoration of the timber and stones of the place. We are here so far the other way, that our rascals, without shame, in great numbers, make such din and clamour in the house of the true God, that if they minted [minded] to use the like behaviour in my chamber, I would not be content till they were down the stairs ". " Robes of sacred office were wanting, firearms and steel blades were in abundance. Never in Scotland had such a representative gathering met in warlike gear to settle the simple question: Who is head of the Scottish Church? ".

The bishops, fourteen in all, had been charged with " Arminianism, Popery, prelatic tyranny, with bringing in the Service Book, the Canons, and the High Court of Commission, excessive drinking, whoring, playing at cards and dice, swearing, profane speaking, excessive gaming, profaning the Sabbath, contempt of the public ordinances and

private family exercises, mocking the power of preaching, prayer, and spiritual conference, and sincere professors; and besides of bribery, simony, selling of commissariat places, lies, perjuries, dishonest dealing in civil bargains, abusing of their vassals, and of adultery and incest, with many other offences." One wonders what these could possibly be. The list of charges is characterized by a Presbyterian historian, as "abominable calumnies against men, many of them venerable for their piety, learning and years, and whose only crime was that they were bishops."

Alexander Henderson, whom Laud wittily called the "Moderator without moderation", had been elected to preside over this Assembly. Not one of the bishops had been given any opportunity to meet the charges brought against him, yet in their absence every one was deposed not only, of course, from his bishopric, but from the ministry altogether. Eight of them were excommunicated as well. Henderson's "awful solemnity" in calling down the Divine approbation on his address and on the sentence, struck terror into the audience. He uttered the dread words: "We, the people of God, and I as their mouth, in the name of the Eternal God and of His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ . . . . do excommunicate the said eight persons from the participation of the Sacrament, from the Communion of the Visible Church and from the prayers of the Church, and so long as they continue obdurate, discharge you all, as ye would not be partakers of their vengeance, from keeping any religious fellowship with them, and thus give them over into

the hands of the devil, assuring you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, that except their repentance be evident, the fearful wrath and vengeance of the God of Heaven shall overtake them even in this life, and after this world everlasting vengeance."

To justify this terrible doom, Henderson said that "the Visible Church only demanded the destruction of the flesh for the saving of the soul." Here, once again, the affinity of Presbytery with Papalism is strikingly seen, for the above doctrine is identical with that which actuated the work of the Inquisition. And would not anyone reading the above excommunication and unaware of its source, almost certainly attribute the sentence to one of the Bishops of Rome, speaking as the supreme pontiff and vicar of Christ?

It was Laud who wrote of this Assembly: "I will be bold to say, never were more gross absurdities, nor half so many, in so short a time, committed in any public meeting, and for a National Assembly, never did the Church of Christ see the like."

II

In 1661 the tide turned again, and Episcopacy once more displaced Presbyterianism as the "established religion". Then we first begin to hear of the "curates"—as used in its primary sense in the Prayer Book for one who held a "cure" of souls—not as later perverted to "vicar"—one who held an office vicariously from another.[1]

[1] In France the terms are still properly applied, the curé being the parish priest, and the "vicaire" his assistant priest.

Following the lead of respectable historians, like Professor Hume Brown, Presbyterian writers still vie with one another in the scorn and ridicule they heap upon "the curates" who, after the restoration of Episcopacy, were sent down from the peaceful Episcopalian north to the turbulent Covenanting Lowlands. The partisanship of these writers is such that they actually take seriously the jocular remark of a northern gentleman that so great was the demand for parsons that he could not get a cowherd!

To the rude Lowlander came these clergy from the Highlands—far more of a foreign country to the Lowlander than either England or France. The curates, of an entirely different class from the wild preachers, were "intruded on a people too fanatical, if not too ignorant, to have any regard for truth, and had these men been as zealous and blameless as the Apostle Paul, they would not have escaped reproach." As a matter of fact, so far from being "unstudied and unbred" and "lewd clod-pates" following the Covenanters' "loved and learned leaders", they were to the full as well intellectually qualified as the generality of the Covenanting ministers. "All of them, by law," says Andrew Lang, "had been forced to send in the names of nonconformist parishioners and that probably was the extent of their offending."

Opening Presbytery's own "Fasti",[1] vol. iii (Synod of Glasgow and Ayr) at random, and turning over the pages till the ministerial records of the Second Episcopate (1662-1689) appeared, these facts are recorded.

[1] See Bibliography, p. 355.

In the parish of Dalrymple, one Robert Kennedy was curate, followed by John Bogle. Neither has any degree after his name, nor had any other previous minister. Each was a Covenanter. At Galston in 1672, Adam Alison, the curate, was an M.A., but at Girvan neither in 1666 nor in 1674 did the then curates, W. Fogo and Alec Gaderer, have any degree. But neither did the two previous Covenanting ministers, nor their two Covenanting successors. At Mauchline in 1665, and at Maybole in 1667, the two curates were M.A.s. But much more striking are the facts which emerge from the Minutes of the Synod of Galloway of October 26th, 1664. They contain names of twenty-four of the "King's curates", whose "ignorance", according to Hume Brown, "made them the laughing stock of everybody". Of the twenty-four only one appears degreeless, and he was a minister's son. All the others were graduates of Scottish universities: one was a D.D., another a literary man, and all were of good social standing—sons of the manse, connections of landed proprietors, or farmers' sons. (Perhaps these were the "clod-plates".)

These few facts will prepare us for what took place in and near Glasgow in 1668-9, rabblings that were in the nature of a retaliation for those of 1661, in respect of the ejections only—*not* of cruelty.

Bound as they were by the terms of the Solemn League and Covenant to "extirpate prelacy, bring malignants to condign punishment", i.e. in pursuit of their fight for "liberty of conscience", Covenanters thus justified their "rabbling of the curates".

These proceedings were begun at the season pre-eminently of peace and goodwill towards men—on Christmas Day 1688, to show proper Presbyterian contempt for the age-hallowed sacred festivals of the Christian Year, called by them " superstitions ".

Govan, is—or was—a famous parish, now in Glasgow. On the evening of Christmas Day 1688, the Rev. Gabriel Russell, who had ministered in the parish for eleven years and had shown the parishioners many acts of kindness, was thus requited. Some of his Presbyterian parishioners, who had shared in his kindness, broke into the manse and beat his wife and daughter as well as himself so inhumanly that his life was endangered. They carried off the poor-box as well as the Communion plate, and left him only after threatening greater severities if he ever again preached in his own church.

In Glasgow generally, however, the city clergy suffered little save personal rudeness and incivility from the rabble, well coached therein by the Covenanters—the true ancestors of the present-day " wild men " of Clydeside, at least as regards their behaviour.

It was customary every Thursday to have prayers and a sermon in all the churches. On Thursday, January 17th, 1689, a mob, chiefly of women, surrounded the Cathedral, intending to drag down from the pulpit the curate, Mr. Milne. Seeing what was threatening, some of his people advised Mr. Milne not to enter the Cathedral, but he did, and futile was his attempt to escape. The viragoes caught him, tore first his gown off, then his other clothes, including his

shirt. They were proceeding to strip him completely naked, when he begged, for the sake of decency, to be allowed to retain his "small clothes". For answer they beat him severely, and, says the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy," "used him in such an indecent manner as is not fit to be named: but it cost him his life."

On the same day the rabble broke with sledge hammers into the manse of the Rev. Alex. George, incumbent of another famous parish, the Barony. Although he was in bed with a dangerous fever, they rudely rushed into his room, and were proceeding to discipline him according to Covenanting methods, when the Provost and an armed escort prevented his murder. The next Sunday there was no service whatever in any of the churches, and afterwards the clergy were separately warned by letter of the consequences that would befall them if they attempted to return to their churches.

Letters sent to friends in London for William of Orange's information, telling him of this persecution of Episcopalians, were countered by Presbyterians at Court, who represented the letters either as "forgeries or the blackest of lies." Hence, Dr. Fall, Dean of Glasgow and Principal of the University, went up to London, and after great difficulty, managed to get William's ear. The Dutchman was shocked at the relation of so many barbarities, and issued a proclamation designed in every way to protect the clergy, both in their homes and in the exercise of their duties. But despite the proclamation and the penalties it imposed, when, at the request of their congregations,

the clergy resumed their functions, more outrages took place.

On Sunday, February 17th, 1689, the curate of Glasgow went to the Cathedral, which was guarded by a self-appointed Presbyterian company, after the fashion of British Fascists and other modern organizations of like type, which usurp the functions of lawfully constituted authorities. Indeed, the account of the interview between the magistrates and the Presbyterian Fascists has quite a modern ring about it. But although the great body of the people desired to attend the church services, all sections of the Covenanters were so violent in their threats, that the magistrates were somewhat cowed. They allowed the rabble to prevent the bells being rung, and to insult the churchgoers, but at last they ordered some halberdiers to clear the streets that the congregation might have access to the Cathedral. It was noted in the contemporary "Case of the Afflicted Clergy" that the congregation were "naked even without arms or the least intention of making any resistance". (This must seem a statement of the obvious to those unaware of the pious practices of the Covenanters who were accustomed to attend their meetings armed, for which habit they could find plenty of warrant in the Old Testament.)

Despite all the intimidation, however, the curate kept on with his ministrations and finished his sermon. By the time the congregation were ready to leave, the Covenanters, who had finished their sermon-hearing, turned out armed to join their Fascist brethren and march upon the Cathedral.

Arrived there, " they fired both upon the people that had fled to the pinnacles and buttresses of the Church and through the door, where there was a little boy dangerously wounded in the face ". Then followed another encounter with the magistrates, whose arguments regarding the dishonour done to God, the flouting of the Prince's declaration and the authority of the Government, were all, of course, of no avail. These Presbyterian Fascists insisted upon the protection of the rabble, who again assaulted the dispersing congregation, not only tearing off women's clothes, and pinching their bodies, but assaulting men with snowballs and even with scythes. These few details from a long circumstantial account are attested by a magistrate of Glasgow, " in the absence of my lord provost ", and are subscribed by two others.

These are but a few of scores of cases which might be instanced, but the subject is nauseating to pursue further, once some samples have been given of how Covenanters fought for " freedom of conscience ". The treatment meted out to the curates is stoutly justified by a Covenanting historian, who thus writes: " A wave of violence spread over the south-western counties of Scotland, as if the worst passions of a rude enslaved people had been unleashed, and got beyond control, the more they recollected the indignities and sufferings to which they had been subjected . . . . No religion has ever yet subdued the Scottish spirit to a clemency willing to overlook and excuse the long course of barbarity which met a paltry retribution in the rabbling of about two hundred Episcopal pastors."

No doubt the reader imagines that it was "ritualistic" services and their accompaniments that were the real root of the rabblings. Not at all. It was, however, only a clear case of "them that dinna like me, winna speak ony guid o' me." The only distinction between Episcopalian and Covenanting services at this time was that in the former the Lord's Prayer, Apostles' Creed, and Doxology were used. But even more offensive than the use of these to the Covenanters was the "Arminian" doctrine that the curates preached—that Christ died for all men.

III

The fine buildings constituting the University of Glasgow that crown Gilmorehill are the successors of the medieval buildings where originally the College gathered in Rotten Row and the High Street—in the neighbourhood of the old Cathedral.

With Glasgow University is associated an Exhibition which is one of the richest in Oxford, if not in Great Britain. This is known as the Snell Exhibition, of which there are now five, each tenable for five years at Balliol.

The founder of this Exhibition was John Snell (1629-1679), a blacksmith's son, born in a parish of Ayrshire, a county exclusively dominated by Covenanters. Snell went to Glasgow College when he was fourteen, and at that age signed the Covenant, quite probably under pressure from the champions of "liberty of conscience". In 1648 he went to England which he never left for thirteen years. During that

time, through the influence of a fellow-countrywoman who was a devout Churchwoman, Snell went into the service of an ardent Royalist, a son of the Bishop of Chester. This gentleman was Sir Orlando Bridgman, who afterwards became Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and Snell came to be employed as Seal Bearer. He married the daughter of an Oxfordshire vicar and had one daughter. Despite, or perhaps because of his upbringing, he became a sincere Churchman, and even his Presbyterian biographer, admits that the Act of Classes [1] passed in 1649, " undoubtedly drove Snell completely into the arms of Episcopacy."

It seems that before he was thirty-five, Snell became Lord of the Manor of Ufton in Warwickshire, and these lands allowed him to make the generous dispositions in his will, which was signed and dated on December 29th, 1677. Two years later he died in Oxford and was buried in the chancel of Holywell Church.

Now in his lengthy will, there are some clauses particularly to be noticed. In one he gives " £50 to and for repairing the Parish Church of Ufton." When he comes to draw up the conditions under which his scholars are to benefit, his trustees are four Oxford dons: and the scholars must be born and educated in Scotland. " AND MY FURTHER MIND AND WILL IS THAT EACH SCHOLAR SHALL FIND SECURITY FOR £500 IF HE SHALL NOT ENTER INTO HOLY ORDERS, OR IF HE SHALL ACCEPT ANY PREFERMENT IN ENGLAND OR WALES, FOR IT IS MY EXPRESS WILL AND DESIRE THAT

[1] See p 141

EVERY SCHOLAR SHALL RETURN INTO SCOTLAND AND THERE BE PREFERRED AND ADVANCED." "And my further mind and will is that all scholars must be recommended by the Principal, Professor of Divinity, etc., of Glasgow College."

It is difficult to see any ambiguity whatsoever in John Snell's intentions, as above expressed. He himself is a devoted "Episcopalian": he left money to his parish church, he elects as his trustees men who were all members of the Church of England: and he enjoins that all scholars shall be recommended by the Principal, Professor of Divinity, etc., of Glasgow College. This, it is of the utmost importance to notice, was at a time when these men would be members of the Established Church of Scotland which was then Episcopalian, and which was so to continue for twelve more years. John Snell certainly had no reason for supposing Presbytery would ever again supplant it.

But the sequel shows how even the law gives no security that the plain provisions of any man's will be honoured, for "law" and "justice" are very different things. As will be seen, it would be difficult to find a case of greater perversion of a testator's clearly expressed "mind and will" than the dispositions of John Snell's charity.

The first attempt to overthrow his intentions was made by the Oxford Trustees after the disestablishment of Episcopacy in Scotland. They having regard to the provision regarding Holy Orders, now sought to secure the charity for the benefit of men desirous of serving in the Church of England. What

Snell's Presbyterian biographer calls this "malversion (*sic*) Bill" was thrown out by the Commons, showing an Anglican appreciation of justice in upholding the provision that beneficiaries should be Scots. But when Snell's daughter later claimed that the Ufton property should revert to her on the ground that Episcopacy had been disestablished in Scotland, and that her father's dispositions were now impossible and illegal, this same biographer acclaims the justice of her plea. Her claim, however, was disallowed, though Snell's provision for the Episcopal ministry in Scotland was ruled out. "That common-sense interpretation has been upheld to the present day," is the comment of the gentleman who had previously talked of a Bill that sought to make void another provision of Snell's will as a "malversion" (*sic*).

Other litigation followed, but none having a vital bearing on the question of Holy Orders till that of 1844. On this, one cannot do better than quote from Snell's biographer. "When 1844 came round the then tolerated Episcopal Church of Scotland, led by men of undoubted ability, was raising her head. Amongst the things that these clever gentlemen saw, which would be of use to them, was Snell's charity. They said: 'We, as a Church, are fulfilling all the requirements of the Will, or can do so, therefore we are entitled to the benefits.' To gain their ends, they entered the Court of Chancery against Glasgow University." As a result of this action, a decision was given in favour of the Church. But the University of Glasgow at once appealed to the House of Lords, and after four years, judgment was given for *them*.

But even Snell's biographer evidently feels there is some need to justify this decision, so in answer to objectors who represented Snell as having deliberately selected Oxford to give a strong Church tone to his scholars, he admits this may be true, but adds the *non sequitur* that it " fails to prove Snell an anti-Presbyterian ". Then, stepping wholly into the realms of Presbyterian imagination, this plausible gentleman says that probably Snell sympathized with the Covenanters, and that seeing the " extremely ignorant Episcopal priesthood " he was moved by compassion for his countrymen and determined to improve the education of the clergy. In view of the fact that John Snell was, ever since leaving Scotland, domiciled in England, and that if he went back more than once it was only on short visits for his master, the Duke of Monmouth, he was not likely to have much opportunity of judging of the alleged " ignorance " of the parochial clergy. Further, it was not till nine years after his death that we first hear of the " ignorance " of the clergy—when they were rabbled.

The last pretence of fulfilling John Snell's expressed wishes has long since gone by the board, except, of course, that only Scotsmen benefit. It is evidently much more important that a scholar should be a Scotsman, even though he never returns to Scotland, as many do not, than that he should be a Christian. For, in the cynical words of a modern Snell Exhibitioner, " After all, even an atheist has an equally good chance of being a great man, so he is rightly as eligible for the Exhibition as anybody else." The

perversion of John Snell's lofty intentions is now complete. What was originally designed to promote goodness in men is now grasped at with a view to attaining greatness—a very different thing.

IV

Glasgow offers the attraction of many beautiful tours by way of the Firth of Clyde. In order, therefore, to have a change from the City and its turmoils, let us take a voyage on the Machrihanish boat and get off at Campbeltown in order to resume our record of suppressed history in country quarters.

A walk of less than ten miles by the inland road from Campbeltown to the Mull of Kintyre, brings us to Keil House. Here is a nice sandy bay on the eastern side of which juts out a precipitous little rocky shoulder. Upon this are the scant remains that mark the site of the old Macdonald stronghold of Dunaverty Castle. This was in 1647 the scene of one of the most atrocious of all the savage deeds of the Covenanters, when they exultantly wallowed in the blood of their helpless enemies, slaying and sparing not.

The Macdonalds at this time were Roman Catholics, like the greater part of the clansmen then. General Leslie was the leader of the Covenanters. "Contemporaries declared that he lacked the traditional honour of a soldier. The butcheries of Philiphaugh and Linlithgow were re-enacted. Huntly's strongholds fell before him—who after having promised to save the lives of all those who were in

the last castle that surrendered to him (I believe Lismore [1]); having said that he would not take a drop of blood from any of the garrison, did not hesitate to hang thirty-five or forty Irish that were found there. Leslie and Argyll, with a force of eight thousand men surprised Macdonald in Kintyre and drove his attenuated force into Dunaverty. . . . By treachery the castle fell. 'Of eight hundred men, women, and children captured,' wrote Montereul, 'four hundred [2] have been massacred in spite of a promise given that all lives should be spared. . . .' Another actor was John Nevay [3], army chaplain, minister at Newmilns, as thorough a Solemn-Leaguer and hammer of malignants as existed, who, in his leisure, sang the *Song of Solomon* and edited the Psalter for the Assembly. . . . Nevay instigated Leslie to make his sword drunk in the blood of the Amalekites. When the brutal carnage was over Leslie, turning to Nevay, inquired, 'Now, Mr. John, have you not once gotten your fill of blood?' The feline tastes of Mr. Nevay otherwise are less traceable than those of his traducers, and there is no justification for the epithets of 'blood-thirsty Nevay' and 'monster as he was' of Mr. Andrew Lang and Mr. W. L. Mathieson." Sir James Turner, Leslie's adjutant-general, in his *Memoirs*, speaking of his superior's action says: "Mr. John Nave (who was appointed by the Commission of the Kirk to wait on him as his chaplain) never ceased to tempt him to that blood-

[1] It was actually Gylen, on Kerrera, opposite Oban.

[2] The real number seems to have been 250, and quarter was not promised.

[3] Variously called Neave and Nave, as well as Nevay.

shed, yea, and threatened him with the curses (that) befell Saul for sparing the Amalekites, for with them his theology taught him to compare the Dunaverty men. And I verily believe that this prevailed most upon David Leslie who looked upon Nave as the representative of the Kirk of Scotland." So this "bloody preacher" is naturally termed an "excellent man" by Wodrow, one of the greatest champions of the Covenanters.

Of all the weary reading the writer has done, wading through voluminous and verbose tomes of Covenanting literature, Dr. Hewison's is the only work in which there is the slightest allusion to this Turkish atrocity. Only quite recently, one Scottish authority of repute wrote an article on the Massacre of Dunaverty, and another Scotsman gave selected details in a book. Neither, however, gave the slightest hint that the barbaric deed was the work of the Covenanters, much less did either mention John Nevay. Both writers, it is needless to say, are Presbyterians. Very few of these, however, can know that their "fine old (metrical) Psalms" [1646] come revised from the blood-stained hands of an arch-instigator of wholesale slaughter.

After Leslie's exploit at Dunaverty, the incident of his capture and subsequent hanging of old Colkitto, father of Montrose's famous lieutenant, is an insignificant trifle. Old Colkitto, in the Castle of Dunniveg, Islay, off the coast of Kintyre, was driven by water shortage to surrender, but he and two sons who were with him were promised freedom. Their only freedom was that given them by the gallows.

Another excursion from Glasgow will take us to Bothwell, just nine miles out of the City by rail, and having in its castle an interesting old ruin. But our concern is with its bridge, on the predecessor of which a battle was fought in 1679 between the Royalists under Monmouth and Claverhouse, and the Covenanting rebels under Robert Hamilton.

Twenty-three days earlier, the Covenanters, under the same leader, at Drumclog, further south-west, had triumphed over Claverhouse and his men—in true covenanting fashion. Sir Robert Hamilton said, "I, being called to command that day, as head gave out that no quarter should be given." The preacher, Thomas Douglas, finally addressed the gathering and said: "You have got the theory, now for the practice." "The practice" included an example given by Hamilton himself, for "with his own hands (he) blew out the brains of a wretched trumpeter some of his followers had taken prisoner and were desirous of sparing." A Covenanting apologist tells us Hamilton had "no alternative" to this callous course. The poor soldier lad begged in vain for his life, and Hamilton afterwards justified the course he had taken in these words: "Non(e) could blame me to decide the controversie, and I bless the Lord for it to this day."

One of this gentleman's eulogists stated that it "grieved Mr. Hamilton when he saw some of Babel's brats spared, after that the Lord had delivered them into their hands that they might dash them against the stones. In his own account of this, he reckons the sparing of these enemies and letting them go to be

amongst their first stepping aside, for which he feared the Lord would not honour them to do much more for him " (God).

There is, of course, the usual monument on the battlefield set up by Covenanting sympathizers, but the only thing that preserves the memory of Hamilton's prowess, where helpless prisoners were concerned, is the " Trumpeter's Well ". It is safe to say, that even to-day, were any attempt made to set up any monument in memory of any of these poor victims of Covenanting butchery, even supposing the land-owners' permission could be secured, liberty-loving Presbyterians would, surreptitiously, soon have it broken and overthrown. (When we return to Glasgow we shall see what further good deeds the Covenanters added to their credit in the interval of their victory at Drumclog, and defeat at Bothwell, which we had left behind us.)

By this time the dissensions which were further to distinguish the Covenanters were in full swing. What time could be spared from slaughter was devoted to the most amazing theological(?) quarrels over the splitting of hairs, which would have left the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages only in the modern category of " also ran ".

The Covenanters went into the battle against Monmouth and Claverhouse abundantly equipped with banners as well as weapons. Six of these banners (still extant) have been illustrated in Volume III of the *Proceedings of the Scottish Antiquarian Society*, and on two of them there is actually " For King ", on another, " For Crown ", and on two more a

crowned thistle—all borne by men fighting against the King. On one banner is a mailed fist firmly grasping an upright dagger, but on the " Bluidy Banner " (see frontispiece) which has no reference to the King, there is far worse. Below Jehovah Nissi, with its dreadful reference to Exodus xvii, 14, is first one line, " For Christ and His Truths ", and then beneath it, " No quarters for ye active enemies of Ye Covenant ". This was carried at Drumclog as well as at Bothwell Brig, and in perfect harmony with this banner, there is this contemporary statement—dismissed by Presbyterian writers as " a modern fiction ": " They were so confident to gaine the victorie that they caused put upe ane extraordinar great gallowes that wold hang thirty or thirty-six persones, upon the which to hang all their oposits that they sould apprehend." As Covenanting partisans hotly dispute the truth of this statement (to which a journalist, writing two days after the battle, added circumstantial details), and that the " Bluidy Banner " was borne by these Covenanters, the only ascertainable " arguments " on their side are given in full at the end of this chapter; so readers can judge for themselves whether those who, admittedly, ordered and gave no quarter at Drumclog, were incapable of bearing such a banner or of providing new ropes for the gallows, even if it were the gallows site long previous to the battle.

Year after year, year after year, on the anniversary of the Battle of Bothwell Brig, there assemble thousands of people to honour the memory of the Covenanters. Hundreds of these attend places of

worship that yearly more closely approximate, in all possible respects, Anglican Churches; and yet they see nothing incongruous in commemorating men who would fiercely repudiate them. Some leading Presbyterian yearly delivers a eulogy, all to the same effect as that of the noble lord [1] who in 1934 told his auditors they honoured the Covenanters solely for " the cause for which they fought ", and that, through their agency, " religious persecution for ever ended ".

After the victory at Drumclog, which the latest minister to heat up the cold dish again calls " the glory of the Covenant ", those who were responsible for its gore marched on Glasgow, where we are now to return.

As the rebels were expected in force there, the King's forces hastily threw up barricades against them. Rejecting as both unverifiable and irrefutable, accounts of Covenanting sacrilege in opening graves and violating their contents in the Cathedral, here are some true items. " In order to maintain discipline, the officers of the Covenanting host found it necessary to shoot a Glasgow butcher, named Watson, who drove a pitchfork through a godly brother, and they also nailed a thief by the ears to the local gallows." For killing the butcher, John Clide, who, unless all Covenanting officers were of the same class, now becomes a " a poor ploughman lad " was subsequently executed. He went to the gallows " certain that his execution of Watson, the butcher, was no barrier to his sanctification and his elevation to angelhood " !

[1] Lord Salvesen, as reported in the *Glasgow Herald*, June 25th, 1934.

V

This chapter may fittingly be concluded by mention of two incidents which might have been taken for its texts, or, indeed, for those of this whole book.

John Kid, a notable field-preacher, captured after Bothwell with a sword in his belt, pleaded that " he carried a short sword merely to disguise himself from being known as a preacher " ! He, with his fellow captive preacher, John King [1], also " disguised " by wearing two pistols, were hanged as rebels at Edinburgh cross, " amongst popular rejoicings ". What a popular " disguise " for preachers weapons were, may be judged from the fact that when the rebels retired from Glasgow to Hamilton, amongst them were no less than eighteen fighting ministers of the Covenant whose watchword was " The Sword of the Lord and of Gideon ".

There is one more incident which should be related before leaving Glasgow. " On the 27th of December, (1712), an English soldier having died (in Glasgow), his officers wished to have him buried according to the solemn ritual of his church." In view of the Presbyterian practice, as enjoined in their " Directory of Public Worship " and still followed in the Presbyterian Highlands, it was no wonder. For the " Directory " lays it down that the dead are to be " immediately interred " on arrival at the burial

[1] In Walker's *Saints of the Covenant*, these two gentlemen are described as " the never-to-be-forgotten, pious, zealous and faithful unto death ministers and martyrs."

place " without any ceremony ".[1] The reason given is that because " praying, reading, and singing, both in going to and at the grave, have been grossly abused, are no way beneficial to the dead, and have proved many ways hurtful to the living; therefore, let all such things be laid aside ". So Mr. Cockburn, a Scottish Episcopalian priest in Glasgow, was procured, and " performed the ceremony in canonicals in the Cathedral cemetery, the company all uncovered, and the rabble looking on with a suppressed rage ". Such an infringement of *their* " liberty of conscience " was this that the Presbyterian ministers " took a look into the Statute Book, to see if they should be obliged to endure this kind of insolence as well as the liturgy ". For Mr. Cockburn had actually " called Amen, the use of this word in the service being so odious to the public ". So naturally, as soon as Queen Anne, the pious protector of the oppressed Church died, " on the eve of August 6th, 1714, the chapel where Mr. Cockburn had officiated" was pulled down.

Opposed to the crossed pastoral staves and mitre surrounded by the motto " Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order " of the Scottish Episcopal Church, is the characteristically Old Testament emblem of the burning bush and *Nec tamen consumabatur* of the present Scottish Establishment, to which the motto has no literal application. The sad and sorry story of Covenanted Presbyterianism holds a record, as savage as any, of a continuous pre-eminence of the arm of the flesh. This non-apostolic succession of

[1] See pp 22, 253.

triumph through force runs through the creation of Knox from the time he first appears in Scotland. We have seen it in these Covenanting atrocities; we shall follow it through the extrusion of the Episcopalian clergy, either by armed preachers alone, or, backed by the forces of the Crown, and the same agency employed later to force Presbyterian preachers upon parishes where they were not wanted, down to the present day. For from the date of the present Establishment in 1689 until the Great War, soldiers, so symbolic of Presbytery's source of success, lined the streets of Edinburgh at the time of the General Assembly. And still yet an escort of cavalry and a salute of twenty-one guns from the Castle is associated with its meeting, for however much the real connection between the two is, and may be truly, denied, the dissociation is not in any way obvious to the beholder. This ceremonial, however, is not borrowed from Canterbury: it is truly Presbytery's very own.

Far more apt than any other Old Testament device descriptive of the Scottish Establishment would be "A sword all proper, guttée de sang", with the motto, *Trucidate neve miseriti sitis*—"Slay and spare not".

[See p. 116]

The History of, and the Case Against, the "Bluidy Banner."

Here is the circumstantial evidence of the well-known antiquarian and artist, James Drummond, R.S.A., as recorded in his paper of June 14th, 1859, in the aforementioned *Proceedings*. A friend had taken him to see this flag, in the possession of a very aged couple, a Mr. and Miss Raeburn, of Dunbar; and after much persuasion, Drummond was allowed to see and to make a sketch in colours of this particular flag. "On asking the old lady why she objected to show it to strangers, she said: 'It's the Bluidy Banner, ye ken; and what would the Roman Catholics say if they kenned that our forebears had fought under such a bluidy banner?'—Roman Catholics, I have no doubt, being a generic term, by which she called all who differed from her in religion. . . . Although proud of being the proprietor of such a relic she seemed at the same time heartily ashamed of the device." The Raeburns gave to Drummond the history of the flag which is briefly this. It originally belonged to Hall of Haughead, a well-known Covenanter and one of the leaders both at Drumclog and Bothwell. Hall's son, on his death-bed, gave the banner to a zealous Covenanting friend, one Cochrane, for his own son had become an Episcopalian

clergyman. Cochrane's son bequeathed the banner to his youngest daughter Mary, who married Mr. Raeburn of Dunbar, the father of the present proprietors. Drummond wrote: "I chose the name of the Bluidy Banner because Miss Raeburn so designated it."

The writer herself saw this banner in Glasgow in the Palace of History at the Scottish Exhibition of 1911. It was lent by Miss H. P. Speirs of Greenock, and was stated to have been borne at both battles. Some little time ago it was exhibited in St. Mungo's, Glasgow, on the occasion of some memorial service of the Cameronians, a regiment recruited in 1689 from the ranks of the Whigs—heirs undoubtedly of the original bearers of the "Bluidy Banner."

Now what is the case against the "Bluidy Banner"? In *Six Saints of the Covenant*, edited by Dr. Hay Fleming, Vol. II., one of these "saints", Walter Smith, described as "that truly pious and worthy minister", in his *Steps of Defection*, No. xiii., p. 77, writes as follows:

"After the Lord gave us the victory over Clavers and his party at Drumclog we behaved not as persons that were fighting the Lord's battles; but instead of pursuing the victory that God wonderfully put in our hands, and sanctifying the Lord of Hosts in our hearts and before the people by giving him the praise, did greedily run upon the spoil, and took some of the enemy prisoners *and gave them quarters*, though *guilty of death*, and so brought ourselves under that curse of doing the work of the Lord de-

ceitfully, *by withholding our sword from shedding of their blood*; and yet we refused to be convinced that our sparing of the lives of these, *whom God has appointed to utter destruction*, is one of the causes why our lives go for theirs." (Italics the present writer's.)

In his note on this, Dr. Fleming (Vol. II, p. 216) writes:

" To me it appears that this traditional evidence is utterly insufficient to connect the banner either with Hall or with Drumclog and Bothwell Brig. There is much better evidence to connect it with Peter Grant." Note 1, p. 167, says Peter Grant's party is described as " a few mean insignificant people "; they seem to have been very few indeed. At that time (1714) they are said to have numbered " at most three men and three women ", and ten years later they could " scarce double that number of men and women." Page 216 continues: " Now, in a rare pamphlet issued by the United Societies in 1742, it is expressely stated that the insignificant party had ' a banner or standard seen by several of us, with this inscription, *Jehovah nissi*: and lower, *For Christ and the Covenants. No Quarters to anti-Covenanters*, or such words.' Though in this passage the inscription is not quoted with precision, the correspondence is so close that there can be no reasonable doubt of the identity of this banner with Drummond's " Bluidy Banner '. Even Drummond, after drawing the banner and its inscription, did not quote it quite correctly." [He wrote in his article *no quarters* " *to* " instead of " *for* "—scarcely the equivalent ot

substituting "anti-Covenanters" for "active enemies of the Covenant".—M.E.M.D.]

Readers may judge for themselves whether all this constitutes, as stated by Dr. Hewison, "a modern fiction already disposed of".

More recently, new explanations have been invented. We are now expected to believe—without any evidence—that somewhere about 1725, Episcopalians, not sufficiently occupied in maintaining their Church's existence, forged this flag. To what purpose, then, we are not told. Or, alternatively, there is the brilliant suggestion that, about this date, after both Covenants had ceased to trouble the land for some twenty years or more, their supporters yet bore this flag, presumably in some unrecorded battle—against whom we are left to conjecture!

Here, Roman tactics are again followed in these weak suggestions, which have not even the merit of plausibility. Rome's denial of Anglican Orders began with the "Nag's Head Fable". This, the name of an inn in Cheapside, was alleged to be the place where Parker, in 1559, went through a mockery of consecration to succeed Pole as Archbishop of Canterbury. Now this tale is universally discredited, but the Romans had to replace it by some other objection. There was no record of Parker's consecration at Lambeth. True, but neither were there records there of the consecration of other bishops the validity of which Romans never disputed. So new objections—all equally untenable—had to be made. This, then is the example that Presbyterians prefer to follow instead of honestly owning up—as is the Anglican habit.

Chapter IV

SCOTLAND'S GREATEST CURSE

I

It would probably still be impossible to come across any Presbyterian Scot who would not wax enthusiastic over the Covenanters. Quite certainly, their admirers constitute the overwhelming majority of all Presbyterian congregations to-day, even of those whose buildings, like St. Giles', Edinburgh, are monuments of the negation of every Covenanting principle.

From amongst ardent supporters of the Covenanters, let us engage with one in conversation on the subject, and the result will suggest the enthusiasm of some Socialists for Soviet Russia—before they have been there. This Socialist enthusiasm built up on baseless theories and a rich imagination, pictures what it wants to see—the freedom from Czardom which the Bolsheviks gained for Russia. The delusion can only be dissipated by the cold facts which will be revealed by an unconducted tour in that unhappy land of tyranny. Similarly, a tour, carefully conducted through Scottish history by some Presbyterian minister will naturally leave the confiding tourists, unaware of his exclusive principles, with the impression that they have been shown the complete picture.

Hence, from a pro-Covenanter who has thus gained

his " history ", we shall hear something to this effect. The Covenanters were forced to fight for the right to worship God in their own way : that they were the champions of liberty of conscience against Charles I who sought to force the English Prayer Book and surplices upon them: that they maintained the fight under the tyranny of Charles II and James VII, and worst of all, of " Bluidy Clavers ". *He* revelled in bloodshed, and was never so happy as when hunting down peaceful pietists and shooting them dead with his own hand—preferably in the presence of wives and children. The Covenanters were a God-fearing, gentle, law-abiding people, entirely inoffensive, and where they were not " Saints " they were " Martyrs " of the Covenant. It is a truly blood-curdling story, most pathetic in all its sorry details—where these are given—for those who know nothing but presbyterianized Scottish history.

If, however, one happens to be a cold-blooded wretch, it is impossible to find historical satisfaction in emotional outpourings and unsubstantiated statements. For if we were to ask our informant, or any other Covenanting enthusiast, if he—or she—could answer the following list of questions, it is safe to predict the flood of eloquence from the well of Covenanting information would speedily be dried up.

(1) Give some idea of the matter of (*a*) The National Covenant, and (*b*) of the Solemn League and Covenant.

(2) Give one instance of the exercise by the Covenanters of "the spirit of liberty " for which they fought.

(3) Name some bishops and curates who went about armed and incited the Royalists to slaughter Covenanters.

(4) How do you reconcile Covenanting banners inscribed with "For King and Covenant" being borne in battle against the King?

(5) What did the (*a*) Act of Classes and (*b*) the Abjuration Oath require? What was the purport and nature of Renwick's Declaration?

(6) How many declarations of Sanquhar were there? Distinguish between them.

(7) How many of the Covenanters did "Bluidy Clavers" himself shoot in Paisley; and how many elsewhere did he (*a*) burn and (*b*) drown?

(8) How many scores of women and children did he order to be slaughtered in cold blood?

(9) Who were (*a*) the Resolutioners and (*b*) the Remonstrants?

(10) Explain the shades of difference between these sections of the Covenanters: Cameronians, Gibbites, Howdonites, Burghers, Anti-Burghers, Adamites, Harlites, McMillanites, and "glancing Glassites", with full particulars of the last named.

One day the occasion of a pleasant talk with a young elementary school teacher gave an opportunity of putting these questions to him with his ready assent. Before he heard them, however, he volunteered the remark that the teaching of Scottish history was entirely one-sided, and this, though a staunch Presbyterian himself, he deplored.

His answers did not take long. He said he had no knowledge whatever of any of the wording of either

Covenant[1]: he had no replies to give to questions two and three, and was nonplussed by question four. He had never heard of the Act of Classes: did not know anything of the wording of the Abjuration Oath, and could give none of the information asked for in question six. He had no knowledge to tell him that question seven was merely a catch, and his answer to question eight was, "About fifty of them, I think." He could not answer number nine, and as regards the last question, he had only heard of Cameronians, whom he correctly stated were the later Covenanters.

To King Charles' despotic and indefensible impositions upon the Scottish Church, culminating in the riot at St. Giles', Edinburgh, Presbyterians conveniently attribute the genesis of the signing of the National Covenant in 1638, and the subsequent rebellion of its subscribers. This following of Jewish precedent, however, had a far different origin. "The Scottish nobles from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century were probably the most turbulent, rapacious, and ignorant in Europe. . . . Their prime foes had been the King and the Church, and they had always cast longing eyes at the fat abbeys and rich glebes of their clerical rivals. The Reformation gave them their chance. Two-thirds of the Church plunder fell into their hands and their Protestantism was mainly determined by self-interest. . . . Their opposition to the Anglicanism of Charles was largely due to the fact that it involved sooner or later a redivision of ecclesiastical plunder." For one of the first acts of Charles as King had been a reclamation from the ignoble

[1] The author has yet to meet the pro-Covenanter who has.

Scottish nobility of some part of the ancient Church revenues for the support of the clergy. These acts had been inspired by the deeply religious spirit and true piety of King Charles, who had himself bought back Church lands and sold some of his own furniture for the adornment of the Chapel Royal. But this example had no effect whatsoever upon the nobles. Further ground for enmity against Church and King was occasioned by Archbishop Spottiswoode's educational schemes, which brought the old parish school system into existence again at the nobility's expense. Knox, indeed, had made ample provision for such a system, but it never got further than paper.

Naturally enough, then, when Episcopacy made such financial demands upon the nobles for the support of religion and education, Episcopacy became—and remained—the enemy so long as by signing a Covenant, Episcopacy's demands on the purse could be withstood. So that the National Covenant, which with its successor, the Solemn League and Covenant, were so long set up as idols which all Scots must fall down and worship, were the horrid offspring of greed in alliance with Calvinism, both of which were threatened.

The same National Covenant that was signed in Greyfriars, Edinburgh, had previously been subscribed as "The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland" in 1580, 1581 and 1590, drawn up by Knox's colleague, John Craig. The extracts from the National Covenant already given[1] are some few of the statements of its three lengthy parts adapted to the

[1] See p. 55.

times, probably by Warristoun and Henderson. These extracts, however, sufficiently indicate its nature.

The ambiguity of the wording, pledging those who signed the Covenant to " stand to the defence of our dread Sovereign ", discloses the cunning of the Covenanter. Whilst it might trap the Royalist by inducing him to suppose he was pledging himself unconditionally to the King's support, whole-hearted Covenanters would see in it merely a promise to stand by the King only so long as he supported and worshipped their idol. This, of course, was the real purport of the pledge, which, for the Covenanter, was made plain by the further clause which vowed the signatories to mutual defence " against all sorts of persons whatsoever ", and did not exclude the King.

How admirably Presbytery and the Papacy agree is shown by this National Covenant and some clauses of the syllabus of that reforming Pope, Pius IX (1846–1878). In this he solemnly anathematized, as pestilential errors, the ideas that:

(1) every man is free to embrace and confess the religion which reason seems to point out as true, or

(2) that the Roman Church has no right to apply physical force, or

(3) that Roman Catholicism has no right to exclude other forms of worship.

II

What support did the Covenant obtain? To begin with, from men so diverse as Montrose and, later, Argyll. Montrose, constant till death in his dislike of

bishops, signed it in Greyfriars, and supported it until April 1644, when he left a pretence for a real support of the King, excusing his change of side in a not very convincing manifesto. Regarding the bulk of the people: "Here and there throughout Scotland were to be found little islands of nonconformity, sparse gatherings of staunch Episcopalian adherents to their uncovenanted priests and professors. The Roman Catholic opposition was a negligible quantity. Some ministers who for a time openly applauded the Service Book and spurned the Covenant were deposed by their Presbyteries". Of the more notable "small oases" in a wilderness of howling Covenanters were St. Andrews, Crail, Aberdeen, Inverness and the remote Highlands. Outside these pleasant havens, however, the worship of the great idol prevailed until the reign of Charles II, when its devotees came to be restricted almost exclusively to south-west Scotland and Fife.

Copies of the National Covenant signed in 1638 were sent broadcast throughout the country, and whilst some of all classes, especially of the ministers, subscribed it eagerly, others were forced to follow suit, on penalty of confiscation of their goods. For the Assembly of 1639, modelling itself on Papal procedure, had enjoined its signing on all Scots. In certain districts indeed the idol was "obtruded upon people with threatenings, tearing of clothes, and drawing of blood"—in the best fashion of Herr Hitler. "In Ayrshire, travellers were refused food and lodging until they had given assurance of being Covenanters".

Of the pressure brought to bear on the educated classes there is a letter of that " singular saint " of the Covenant, and Clerk of the Assembly, Johnston of Warristoun, who in writing to a noble relative assured him of the curses that would fall upon those who opposed the great idol. " I make not question but the great God, the patron of this work, will trample them down and erect over their bellies the trophies of His victory. God has said it and He will perform it."

It was for this reason, evidently, to save, or attempt to save non-Covenanted souls from such a fate that private " conventicles " (or meetings) which only the uncovenanted would attend, were forbidden. It is of great importance to note this, for when later, the tables were turned, and conventicles were made by Covenanters the occasion for the meeting of armed rebels, and were in consequence suppressed, the protests of the persecuted saints rent the heavens.

In 1641, Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, was executed on Tower Hill, and next year Civil War broke out in England. " The sight of Strafford's blood gave the Puritans and the Presbyterians a tiger's thirst for more. The Israelites would be drunken with the blood of the Gibeathites before they would feel satiated ". Consequently, in 1643 the General Assembly set up another idol, greater even than the last.

This was the Solemn League and Covenant which was calculated to attach the English Puritans as faithful helpmeets, and, by their aid, to be set up in England. The English Puritans, of course, were in arms already against the King, and as the Covenanters designed to join up with them, the title of the bond of

union was as follows:—" A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation and Defence of Religion, the Honour and Happiness of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland ". The document stated that the signatories have " before our eyes the glory of God . . . the honour and happiness of the King's Majesty, and his posterity, and the true public liberty, safety and peace of the kingdoms, wherein everyone's private condition is included ". Amongst the many things which this Covenant's signatories do swear is: " That we shall . . . without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy (that is Church government by archbishops, bishops . . . deans, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive their plagues. . . ."

" We shall with the same reality, sincerity and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavour with our estates and lives, mutually to defend the King's Majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms that the world may bear witness with our consciences, of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish His Majesty's just power and greatness. . . . And this covenant we make in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all Hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day when the secrets of

all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by his Holy Spirit for this end . . . (for) encouragement to the Christian churches groaning under, or in danger, of the yoke of anti-Christian tyranny ".

In order to dispose the Scottish people to accept this new idol, an exhortation was drawn up and circulated amongst them. Dated " Die Veneris,[1] February 9, 1643, the first part of it runs: " If the power of religion, or solid reason, of loyalty to the King, and piety to their native country, or love to themselves, and natural affection to their posterity . . . can awaken an embroiled bleeding remnant to embrace the sovereign and only means of their recovery, there can be no doubt but this solemn league and covenant will find, wheresoever it shall be tended, a people ready to entertain it with all cheerfulness and duty ". For those, however, in whose hearts this moving appeal found no echo, there was the usual alternative of confiscation of all their goods.

The new idol having thus formed the basis for an armed alliance between the Covenanters and the English Puritans against the King, the former marched into England. For the enlightenment of the English people generally, amongst many pamphlets published was one called *Six Considerations of the Lawfulness of our Expedition into England*. This carefully explains that the expedition was aimed

[1] Although the Holy Days of the Christian year have been consistently reprobated by Presbyterianism, it is interesting to notice that the pagan style " Day of Venus " is preferred before " Friday " (the derivation of which is not so obvious) in dating this Covenanting exhortation.

neither against the King nor England, but only against "the Canterburian faction of Papists, Atheists, Arminians, Prelates, the misleaders of the King's Majesty, and the common enemies of both kingdoms". These are delicately stigmatized as "the troublers of Israel, the firebrands of hell, the Korahs, the Balaams, the Doegs, the Hamans, the Tobiahs and the Sanballats of our time".

The latest editors of the *Memoirs of Montrose* write:—"The Scottish League and Covenant was an unprovoked invasion of England on the part of Presbyterian propagandists seeking by help of a faction in England to impose on that country an alien form of Church discipline". And regarding pressing the Solemn League and Covenant on England, Colonel Buchan says:—"In return Kirk and nobility had involved their land in a course of hypocrisy and dishonour. They wished both to have their cake and eat it: in the Solemn League and Covenant, of which the price was armed rebellion, they vowed also to 'preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority.' They had broken a plain contract with the King".

III

When Presbytery thus approached its triumph, it began the exercise of papal powers, unrestricted and infallible. Hence the bishops were condemned by the Covenanters for their meddling in civil and secular affairs, for this was to infringe the prerogative of the Presbyterian Papacy. Without the papal decrees of

the Covenant no one might hold any opinion; no one dare call in question the divine right of Presbytery, or exercise the right of private judgment; no assent could be given for an Act of Parliament to pass. Further in 1638, that zealous saint, Johnston of Warristoun, had been made censor of the Press by the Assembly, which decreed that "nothing that concerned the Acts of the Assembly, nor any treatise which concerned the Church should be printed without Mr. Archibald Johnston's warrant, under pain of all ecclesiastical censure".

Here was an exact following of the lead given by the Papacy at the Lateran Council of 1515. This formulated the decree *De Impressione Librorum*, which required that no work should be printed without examination by proper ecclesiastical authority, the penalty of unlicensed printing being excommunication of the culprit, and confiscation and destruction of the books.

A recent Presbyterian writer, referring to the Covenanters at this time, speaks of the "Scots with their strange combination of religion and loyalty to their Stuart King". The quality of their loyalty was indeed passing strange—and a faithful following of those other political intriguers, the Jesuits. It moved the Covenanters in 1639 to write a secret letter to Louis XIII of France seeking an alliance with him against King Charles, his brother-in-law.

Though this particular letter was almost certainly never despatched, later a similar one was, for it was intercepted and shown to the King. This letter the Covenanters had addressed *au roy*—a style restricted

to subjects addressing their own king. When in April 1640 King Charles showed this traitorous letter of his professed devoted supporters, he drew special attention to the incriminating style *au roy*.

Thus this letter makes it clear that, when it suited their purpose, Covenanters could depart from their first principle of forcing the Covenant upon all with whom they had to deal. Hence a foreign king and a Roman Catholic, whom they had implicitly accepted as their sovereign, was dispensed from conditions they sought to impose upon their rightful King—a staunch anti-Papalist in spite of every inducement held out to him to " go over to Rome ". For when Queen Henrietta Maria appealed to the Pope for funds, the papal condition was that King Charles should first abandon his religious principles—in secret, if he liked. But no considerations would induce the King to renounce his faith[1] in favour of that of Rome or the Covenanters, who still professing their loyalty were ready, when the chance came, and their services could be bought, to fight against Charles.

In 1646, the King, defeated at Naseby, cast himself at Newark upon the protection of the Army of those loyal Scots who had so covenanted to support him. With them he spent a delirious year in the enjoyment of a hospitality which was calculated to be most uncongenial to him. This was displayed in their preachers' pleasant personalities, extending to the choice of the metrical psalms, fresh from manufacture at Westminster, as well as in their wondrous expositions of the Old Testament.

[1] See p. 45

But even more than their beloved King's company did the Covenanting army desire the pay that was owing to them, as hirelings, by the English Parliament for their military services against the King. Fortunately, they had him to bargain with, and he, baited as he had never been in his life before by their persistent ministers, readily gave his assent to a change of captors. The Covenanters, loyal to the last, took sureties from the English Peers and Commons for Charles's personal safety, and then, conscious of this devotedly loyal act, proceeded happily to collect the debt due to them for fighting with the rebel Roundheads. But despite months spent in wrangling, the poor defrauded Covenanters were forced to depart home with only half of the wages due to them—a miserable £200,000 instead of £400,000.

Early in 1647 the King was handed over, as the Covenanting army, thirty-six of their carts filled with specie, returned over the Border. As these godly soldiers passed through Newcastle, the women of the ungodly were with difficulty restrained from stoning them, and the cry of "Judas!" went up. And soon throughout France as well as England jeering songs were sung on the subject of the "Traitor Scot[1]" who "sold his King for a groat!"

Hilaire Belloc, in his book on *Charles the First*, asks the questions: "Had the Scotch played the part of Judas? Was the King 'sold?'" And this is his answer.

[1] Since the taunt applied to a section of Lowlanders only, "Covenanting Scot" would have been the proper description.

"The facts are plain and known, and every man can judge for himself. Charles was not sold in the sense that his captors merely took new money for him; it was rather as though Judas had already been owed sixty pieces of silver by the party of the High Priest, and had consented to take thirty. Further, Charles was not sold from a position of freedom and security, with friends, to a position of servitude under an enemy; the Parliament might well prove to be easier masters than the Scotch, and Charles himself had envisaged making terms with them. Lastly the Scotch could say that they would have kept Charles and given him all the security he wished, and even all the liberty, had he but taken the Covenant—but he had refused.

"With all these reservations and making all these allowances, it is none the less true that Charles was sold in the sense that the Scotch handed him over for money, and that, but for the money, he would not have been handed over. The money was the decisive factor."

The Assembly of 1646 had ordained that not only all who had been "out" with Montrose, but those who had had any dealings with him or who had drunk his health, should be excluded from partaking of the Communion until they had made public acknowledgment of these sins. Usurpations of the sphere of the civil authority succeeded to such as these on the borderline, until issue was joined when Presbytery set up the papal chair in Scotland, and pursued, on lines parallel to those of Rome, its mistress, its progress towards supremacy in the land.

A treaty, called the "Engagement" was the occasion for the Presbyterian Papacy to defy the

authority of its own parliament. Whilst King Charles was a prisoner at Carisbrooke, he made a treaty there with two Scottish Commissioners of the Estates. Whilst he engaged to confirm—but not himself to sign—the Solemn League and Covenant, and to establish Presbytery for three years, the Commissioners, on their part, engaged to restore the King by force of arms. The Scottish parliament approved the Engagement, but not so the Covenanting papal authorities of 1648. What Parliament decreed the Assembly opposed, and four months were spent in wrangling between the rival authorities. The preachers, of course, following in the footsteps of the Dominicans of the Inquisition, took the field to inflame the people in probably very much the same fashion. They raised the whole of the West of Scotland, crying up " King Jesus " against King Charles.

Turner, a minister's son, but himself a soldier, was sent by Parliament to reduce Glasgow to order, and imposed " Turner's Covenant " on the rebels, an impious proceeding, since its assentors declared submission to Parliament. This was, of course, intolerable, so the godly, to the number of 2,000 horse and foot, fully armed, on Saturday, June 10, 1648, flocked to Mauchline in Ayrshire. They were accompanied needless to say, by seven ministers, including that sweet singer of Israel, Mr. John Nevay. Next day the preachers held a field Communion service, seeing nothing unseemly in making the Prince of Peace's Own Service an occasion of broiling and bloodshed, for this followed upon their thanksgiving on the Monday. One can hear the gentle Nevay join-

ing in his own choice metrical version of Psalm 120, verses 6 and 7.

> My soul with him that hateth peace
> Hath long a dweller been
> I am for peace; but when I speak
> For battle they are keen.

On the arrival of government troops to disperse the rebels, though they were offered a pardon on surrender, some of them insisted on fighting, and thence gained from Turner the dreadful name of " slashing communicants ".

" The savage and stupid barbarism of the Covenant, which had revelled in blood in the Lord's name," writes Buchan, " now [Jan. 1649] seemed at last to have reached omnipotence, for it had destroyed the centre of all civil order ". In 1649, too, the discriminating Act of Classes was drawn up, probably by the indefatigable and astute official of the Covenanting Papacy, Warristoun.

This act was so called because it divided up the Royalists into several classes, according to the depth of their " malignancy ". Its purpose was to exclude these criminals from any office or position of trust unless they first did penance. It " excluded from every office—from a minister of state to a borough diaconate of crafts—all who were not of the narrow type in political and religious opinions and conduct, and which gave the kirk an absolute veto on all public appointments. It was as if the theocracy had set out to caricature itself, and it was fast disillusioning every sympathiser who had the smallest share of practical wisdom ".

On March 23, 1649, the Covenanting dictators, who had thought it an abominable and unparalleled practice " when the Usurper had murdered King Charles, forced Parliament to behead the Marquis of Huntly who had been a close prisoner for over a year.

If a Royalist can be trusted to tell the truth, Sir Ewan Cameron may be quoted on the state of affairs when the Covenanting Papacy was at its height.

" Every parish had a tyrant who made the greatest lord in his district stoop to his authority. The Kirk was the place where he kept his court: his pulpit his throne or tribunal from whence he issued out his terrible decrees: twelve or fourteen soure ignorant enthusiasts, under the title of elders, composed his council. If any of what quality soever, had the assurance to disobey his edicts, the dreadful sentence of excommunication was immediately thundered out against him, his goods and chatels confiscated and seazed, and he himself as being looked upon as actually in the possession of the devill and irretrievably doomed to eternal perdition, all that conversed with him were in no better esteem ".

IV

Yet, curiously enough, for all that Presbytery " only is the true Christian faith and religion, pleasing God ", its fruits appear to be just as bad as those of the old Roman Papacy, and such as those that were charged but never substantiated against Prelacy in the persons of the bishops of 1638.

For in October 1648, it was actually necessary for

the Covenanters themselves to make " A Solemn Acknowledgment of Public Sins ". After asserting failure to extirpate " what is contrary to the power of godliness " examples are given of that " ungodliness " that " hath gone over the face of the earth as a flood. It were impossible to reckon up all the abominations that are in the land, but blaspheming of the name of God . . .. uncleanness, drunkenness, excess and rioting, lying and deceit, railing and cursing, are becoming ordinary and common sins ".

In view of this, there can scarcely be any aspersion cast upon the truth of a statement by an English soldier who, in writing from Scotland in 1650, had a similar tale to tell, proving that the above " Solemn Acknowledgment " had not brought about any noteworthy reformation. " As for the sins of adultery and fornication ", he writes, " they are as common among them as if there were no commandment against either. . . . Whoredom and fornication is the common darling sin of the nation. . . . Instead of having no other God but one, the generality of people . . . do idolise and set up their ministers, believing what they say, though never so contrary to religion and reason ".

There is a familiar ring about this charge—commonly still alleged by Orangemen against the ignorant Irish peasantry, blindly led by a still more ignorant and dangerous priesthood. But at least it could never be charged against the Covenanters that they ever failed in their duty of suppressing witchcraft: indeed they might well boast that for this they held the European record. For under Covenanting

sovereignty witch-hunting in Scotland flourished as nowhere else in the world, and gave great scope for the exercise of those peculiar talents so distinctive of the untainted Covenanter, as well as exhibiting once again Presbytery's close affinity with Papalism, and more particularly again with the political activities of the Jesuits.

In England and elsewhere the torture which accompanied the trials of suspects had become a matter for the secular courts. Not so in Scotland when the people enjoyed the dictatorship of the Covenanting ministers. These introduced and maintained methods well calculated to destroy the powers of Satan they descried in others. Elders and Church members alike delighted to follow the lead of their ministers in pursuit of this pious work. Those who were specially privileged to test witches were called "prickers", from their use of sharp irons to thrust into the flesh of the suspected. The Inquisitor's Manual of 1489, the *Malleus Maleficarum*, was the handbook with which the tortured victims were plied with questions.

The counties of Renfrew, Lanark, Haddington, Linlithgow and Fife, all strongholds of the Covenant, were distinguished above all others for the detection and condemnation of their innumerable witches—a testimony to the zeal of the ministers with whom the inhabitants were favoured. Not even the expenditure of money deterred the fervour of the ministers, for the detection and burning of witches was a costly affair, of which the Kirk paid one part, and the town or parish the other.

Between 1640 and 1649 the General Assembly

passed no less than five Acts condemnatory of witchcraft and witches, proclaiming the procedure to be followed in uprooting the sin. When it was reported to the Assembly of 1643 that in the County of Fife alone thirty ancient dames had been burnt alive under suspicion of witchcraft during the last few months, the approval with which this report met was shown by the fact that within another month, many more witches, in the same county, were similarly disposed of.

There is a record of English Commissioners of Justice meeting at Leith in 1652 when two women who had confessed to witchcraft were brought before them. Questioned why they had confessed, it appeared that their treatment might have had something to do with it. Whilst they were hung up by their thumbs, they were whipped, lighted candles were set beneath their soles and between their toes; and to complete the examination, lighted candles were thrust into their mouths. There had been six women treated in the same fashion, but four died from the treatment before they could be brought before the English magistrates. These " ordered the ministers, sheriff and tormentors to be found out and to have an account of the ground of their cruelty ".

It is a Presbyterian estimate that gives the number of witches who were put to death in Scotland as " upwards of 4,000 ", whilst the *Encyclopædia Britannica* states that modern research estimates the number of victims burnt by Torquemada at 2,000. The last trial and execution for witchcraft took place at Dornoch in 1722, but during the second Episcopate the evil tradition, to some extent still persisted.

Sometimes, however, appeals were made against the findings of the ecclesiastical courts, and in the records of the Privy Council there is one engrossed " complaint of Margaret Thomson, wife of Archibald Gray, in Calder, against the Tutor of Calder, and the minister thereof ". This lady, suspected of witchcraft, complained that on August 20th, 1644, she was forced to stand dressed in sackcloth, in one place, and for twenty-six days not allowed to sit down, and being kept awake all the time. (Here we have a far from isolated example of the Covenanters forestalling the Bolshevik methods of the Metropolitan-Vickers' trial in Moscow.) Margaret wished to " interrogate the minister whether or not he did straik (strike) the supplicant with his wand, and because the same was not of great force, he did straik her with a rung " (cudgel). On October 2nd she stated she " was apprehended by the order of the Tutor of Calder and the minister there, and putt and keeped in the vestrie of the Kirk of Calder and cruellie tortured for the space of a quarter of a year."

On November 21st it is recorded that " about twenty days since she convened the Tutor of Calder and the minister thereof before the Lords of the Privy Council, for their cruell dealing against her in making her the space of twenty days naked, and having nothing on her but sackcloth." The Lords ordered the defendants to appear before them and produce evidence against her of the sin of witchcraft. Since then, however, she avers she has been " laid in the stocks and keeped in great miserie, separate from all companie and worldly comfort, and can see no end

to her miserie except by lawfull tryall." After hearing both sides the Lords ordered Margaret Thomson to be set at liberty, but as a witch, she was bound to appear again before the justices, if called upon to do so under penalty of 5,000 merks. The minister and his colleague were, of course, not punished.

The minister of Calder, who was one of the most vigilant and tireless of all the Covenanting pastors in his activities against witches was a Mr. Hew Kennedie. His biographer, who gives an account of these activities, referring to the overthrow of the Covenanting despotism at the Restoration, remarks that Kennedie " could not expect to escape completely, though martyrdom was not to be his lot ". He was one of the gentlemen deposed from the ministry on December 7th, 1660, " for guilt in those things which concern His Majesty in the defence of the Kingdom ", and also " for being a firebrand among his brethren and for a book entitled *The Cause of God's Wrath Upon Scotland*."

His biographer states that this minister was " one of the earliest sufferers in the cause of the Covenant ". It was, no doubt, in recognition of this that Presbytery honoured him by selecting him in 1690 to be the first Moderator of the General Assembly after Presbyterianism was set up by Act of Parliament as " the Church of Scotland ". As we have it on best Covenanting authority that in this General Assembly, " These men of the Covenant were saints first and last and midst without end ", it is interesting thus to have had a glimpse of, presumably the then head saint, in Moderator Kennedie.

V

The greatest " catch " that the Covenanters ever secured was the solemnly sworn adherence of Charles II, not only once, but twice, and not only to one, but to both Covenants. After his Coronation at Scone, when the King had on his knees sworn faith to both idols, Mr. Robert Douglas, the Moderator, who officiated, thus proudly addressed him: " Sir, you are the only Covenanted King with God and His people in the world." True, the part had been forced upon him, as it had been upon thousands of his subjects, equally unwilling, so that it is strange to find the King alone singled out for diatribe by a Covenanting enthusiast. He says: " For an indecent outrage on religion and patriotism one could not readily find a match to that perpetrated at Scone by the libertine Charles ".[1] Yet his conscientious father was also condemned for *not* signing.

In order that the young should be brought up in the way they should go, some had their own little idols.

The latest teller of the ancient story has one chapter headed " Little Beatrix Umpherston and the Children's Bond ", full, as may be imagined, of moving details of pious precocity. This child of ten, with fourteen other like-minded little saints, signed a Covenant known as the " Children's Bond ". " This touching Covenant of Childhood "—a " sweet and serious

[1] Taking a different view, the Covenanting Provost, Jaffray, said " He sinfully complied in what we most sinfully pressed on him, wherein, I must confess, to my apprehension, our sin was more than his.

children's bond "—alludes, in child-like fashion, to "soul-murdering curates", and contains other similar phraseology of the nursery.

Even more attractive is the story of Emilia Geddes, as given in that book which no one should miss reading, Smellie's *Men of the Covenant*. He quotes from *Some Few Choice Sentences and Practices of Emilia Geddes*, who died, not surprisingly, at the age of fifteen.

Before she was nine, she had established her own "Praying Society", and to it on one occasion a complaint was made of the shocking conduct of one of its members. She had actually been to hear a curate preach—a sure road to hell—in the Church at Strathmiglo. She had also laughed once during public prayer, which, though probably it gave her good reason to do so, was no excuse for her conduct, and had spoken "untenderly of some godly people".

How was this grave defection on the part of one of the members to be met? "A little court was formed and Emilia was chosen to preside. . . . The culprit . . . . admitted meekly that there was some truth in all the charges. . . . Then the president, after a discourse to the meeting, announced her verdict: 'That the offender should not be debarred from the Society, but allowed to be present with them for hearing and converse, but . . . . she should not be permitted to pray with them for the space of a month; so that, during that time, they might have occasion to observe her deportment and she might have access to improve herself'."

VI

Having gained some idea of the nature of the Covenants and of what issued from them, we now come to their saints and martyrs.

First of all, however, it is important to realize that whereas some Covenanters are both saints and martyrs, there is none of any prominence who is not either one *or* the other. Every single individual who fell in battle in the Covenanting ranks: every single Covenanter put to death for treason, rebellion or murder—all alike thereby automatically by the canonization of the Covenant, became "martyrs". The rest, like the Rev. Hew Kennedie, Moderator of the Revolution General Assembly, who failed to achieve "martyrdom", take rank amongst the saints—of the Covenant.

A sympathizer describes the virtues of the ministers collectively as follows: "The Scots clergy, abhorring celibacy, cultivated domestic and social happiness, and were noted for hospitality, toleration and humanity which they enjoined in others." Here is one of the examples given to illustrate this statement—the minister of Dalgety ejected in 1662 for, let us hope, a pastor who stayed more in his parish. "In 1645 the minister himself went to the war. Under such a pastor . . . . the whole tone of the parish was raised. Humanitarianism was the rule. Hence we find the poor cared for, a lame soldier provided for, etc., etc., and the uncharitable publicly rebuked for their 'hardness of heart'. Could the English critic

have produced any individual or parochial parallels to such love of the brethren? " The answer is, of course, that at this time, as always, there never failed faithful parish priests in England, of whom George Herbert, Rector of Bemerton, near Salisbury, and William Mompesson,[1] Rector of Eyam, Derbyshire, in 1664, may be cited as two examples. But one must admit that their " love of the brethren " did not extend to deserting their flocks committed to their charge by leaving their parishes, armed as soldiers.

But in Scotland: " The outed ministers and evicted rebels no doubt retained a large portion of the old Adam. . . . We shall find one exasperated ' stickit minister ', James Mitchell, drawing a bad shot at Archbishop Sharp; another pietist, Skene, justifying the poisoning of the balls of blunderbuss . . . . and a few cases of the shedding of the blood of soldiers, curates, and informers in open fray. . . . Bearing in mind the rudeness of the age, the illegal acts of the King and subordinates, and the provocations received, one is astonished that retaliation was not oftener resorted to, that offences were so infrequent, and that the persecuted exhibited so much Christian restraint. There is scarcely any parallel to it." This latter assertion cannot possibly be contradicted, and as regards the statement that, " The fight was for freedom, morality, virtue, and religion ", that has already become abundantly clear in these pages.

[1] He was the hero of the plague of 1665. When infection reached the village, he persuaded his people to confine themselves within its bounds, and when necessaries had to be purchased from outside, to place the money for them in running water.

Regarding the Covenanting ministers, Colonel Buchan says that " it must not be supposed that all were violent and illiterate peasants and mob orators. Many of the demi-gods were well born and well educated " and amongst these, he instances Samuel Rutherford (1600–1661) as a real scholar.

This gentleman, " the pre-eminent saint of the Covenant ", was, indeed first " Regent of Humanity " for two years at Edinburgh, and subsequently Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews. In between, he was, according to the latest Covenanting copyist, " the saint of Anwoth ", that is, its minister; and his adultery is delicately passed over by the statement that " a breath of scandal dimmed the brightness of his youth, and after teaching Latinity for two years he had to resign ". The same writer states of Rutherford that " all through his life he was absorbed in Christ ", and that if he " was anything, he was first and last a preacher of Christ ". If, however, Rutherford was " belligerent of instinct ", yet he was " chastened with Christian culture "—despite the fact that he was the " author of that most unsaintly book, *Lex Rex* ".

But another writer puts a different construction on this work, for he says, " Full of seditions and treasonable matter as the *Lex Rex* was announced to be, its teaching lives to this hour." Further: " Rutherford was one of the most extraordinary men in an age of heroes. An ecclesiastic forgets at times the urbanity of thought and the courtesies of speech. But when these deductions are made, he still rises to a stature attained by only the select few in Christ's dazzling

host—by a St. Bernard, a Madam Guyon, a Brainerd." To compare this truly " singular saint ", the rampant politician-preacher Rutherford with St. Bernard, is like comparing Robert Burns with St. Francis of Assisi. Balfour, the Lyon King of Arms of Rutherford's age, writes of him as: " Loose in his youth, a hater of all men not of his opinion, and one who, if never so lightly offended, was irreconcilably void of mercy and charity."

The Covenanters always wrangling amongst themselves, and true to the Presbyterian tradition, increasingly dividing and subdividing, are in these days impossible to follow through all their splits, and splits *from* splits. After wearily wading through a welter of Covenanting literature, one gets entirely bemused, and the mind reels in any attempt to differentiate one splinter from another, and to keep in mind the minute, or intricate distinctions that obliged one lot religiously to fly at the throats of all the others.

From 1662 to 1672, they were divided into " Resolutioners " and " Protestors " or " Remonstrants ", the latter being the less intolerant. Rutherford was a Protestor, but had for his ministerial colleague at St. Andrew's, one Blair, a Resolutioner. That the great saint should consent to be a joint minister with a Resolutioner was truly remarkable, but it was not to be supposed that they could together minister at the Lord's Table. So for six years there was no Communion in that Kirk, blest as it was with these two saints for ministers. Among the many books Rutherford published was one called *A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience*, which

Bishop Heber characterized as " perhaps the most elaborate defence of persecution which has ever appeared in a Christian country ". The author of this and other equally saintly tomes was, not surprisingly, in view of his seditious activities, charged with high treason, and only his death probably saved him from martyrdom by the gallows.

Such is the prince of the saints of the Covenant—likened by Dr. Smellie to him, who, in the ranks of the real Saints, those of Catholic Christendom, shines in splendour as the best and greatest of all the monks. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the Doctor " flowing with honey ", stands pre-eminent as a man of a mighty heart, humble, tender, and loving. Refusing every call to high office, by the force of his character, the holiness of his life, his fearlessness in denouncing evil in the highest places; his moving eloquence; his complete devotion to Jesus Christ as perfect God and perfect Man, he swayed the whole of western Christendom throughout the earlier part of the twelfth century. " More pope than the pontiff " yet " the humility of his heart surpassed the majesty of his fame ". Alone in his day, St. Bernard the Great was the one man to show pity for the Jews, for he exerted all his influence and power to end their persecutions wherever he found them.

A more candid writer remarks " that Samuel Rutherford should be cited as a saint can be due only to a misconception of the meaning of the term, or to want of acquaintance of the life and character of the man ", and one may add, to complete ignorance of the lives of any of the true saints.

VII

James Guthrie, the well-born minister of Lauder, son of "Guthrie of that ilk", was another saint of the Covenant, and because he exalted the duties and privileges of ministers far above those of the monarchy, against which he plotted, he was hanged in 1661 despite Archbishop Sharp's exertions to have his life spared. Guthrie had employed English soldiers to intrude godly ministers, and had charged some sixty of his own parishioners before English judges because they had opposed his intrusion of a colleague more fanatical than himself.

"There was in him, as in the best of men of his age, a touch of old-world credulousness", and so great is Smellie's idolatry of Guthrie, that he even dares to say of him on the scaffold that "onlookers thought they had not seen more of God at the most solemn Communion". Indeed, for Christians—using the word, not in cant, but in its original sense of all the baptized—Smellie's chapter on Guthrie—"The short man who could not bow"—is quite blasphemous in its comparisons.

Another Presbyterian, free of this idolatry, says of "the heavenly-minded" James Guthrie that "in his day of power he had shown no mercy, and in his turn he received none, nor could it be possible that he should. A true son of Andrew Melville, the founder of the Scottish Presbyterianism, he saw two kings in Scotland, the one the earthly monarch, the other the heavenly domination of Presbytery as embodied at

its highest in the Covenants." To these, as of divine right, the King and the State, together with all the people must bow down and obey. Hence, when the State refused to accept the claim, issue was joined.

Once more the affinity of Presbytery with Papalism becomes evident in its demand that nothing was of Cæsar's to render unto him, but all was God's—as misrepresented by an earthly tyranny. No one who applauds resistance to the pretensions of the Papacy can consistently condemn opposition to the equally arrogant pretensions on the part of Covenanted Presbytery.

A modern instance provides to some extent a parallel to the conduct of the intractable Covenanters and the fate they inevitably brought upon their fellows whom they so culpably misled. During the Papacy of Pius X, the French Republic had decreed that religious, in common with all other societies in the land, should ask, and obtain, Government authorization. Thanks, however, to successive lax administrations, the law had not been much enforced, so that, of the innumerable religious congregations which had sprung up like mushrooms, increasingly since 1870, when Papal Infallibility was decreed, not one in ten had attempted to comply with the law's requirements. Repeatedly, there had been opportunities when had these societies applied for authorization, it would have been granted. In 1880 even the Papal Nuncio advised the communities to join in a declaration of loyalty to the constitution of France, so that they might then have secured legal standing. But this they absolutely refused to do, and in the circumstances it

was equivalent to declaring war against the State—not the republic only.

They received warning in 1898 of the nature of the legislation which was impending in case of their persistence not to conform to the law of the land. But this had no effect whatsoever upon the religious orders. They answered, in effect, that the Pope was their master, not the Government, and to apply to the Government to legalize their position would be to surrender to Cæsar the things that were God's. So when the law of 1901 was passed, the recalcitrant religious were given the alternative of authorization or dissolution.

Many of them, like their forerunners, the saints and martyrs of the Covenant, preferred dissolution to not getting their own way outside their legitimate sphere. But, unlike the Covenanters, even these did not resort to force of arms and bloodshed, nor even to treasonable practices. Those others, who, at the eleventh hour, had receded from an impossible position, were by no means graciously received. The Chamber of Deputies, exasperated by their prolonged resistance, and having learnt from experience that their existence, like that of the rabid Covenanters before them, constituted a menace to society generally, adopted a hostile attitude. In consequence, of all the unauthorized but now submissive orders of men, six only obtained authorization, the belated demands of the majority being rejected in the mass and without any consideration of their case.

Dr. G. G. Coulton's comment upon this applies equally well to the situation created by the obstinate

truculency of the Covenanters, substituting only "Presbytery" for "Rome" and "the Pope"; and "the State" for "the French" in his last sentences. The learned writer remarks: "That the innocent suffered with the guilty is probable. . . . To associate oneself with evil-doers is to share their ill repute, and often their fall. In this quarrel . . . it is not possible to defend all the acts of the Government, but the point is those of Presbytery were often still more indefensible. Presbytery denied the right of the State to be masters in their own house."

As offering something of a comment on the foregoing, a Covenanting enthusiast may be quoted. He writes: "Christian or not, the Covenanters had enough manliness to resist . . . every attempt on the part of Cæsar to roll Christ's Crown in the dust, and then to repel any other affront of the sword, interposing the body as a shield for the soul." This certainly cannot be reconciled with the words of Him who said, "If my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," but it is in entire consonance with Dr. Warr's approbation of the quotation, already given, that without the signing of the Covenant, although it 'incarnadined the fields, the streets of Scotland', the triumph of Presbyterianism would have been impossible."

Truly, "Jacob Curate" (of whom we shall hear more later), wrote: "The Scots Presbyterian preachers laboured, not to make good Christians, but rigid Presbyterians." And amazing was the extent of their success.

VIII

To those who appreciate cowardice allied with cunning amongst other virtues, the characters of the two outstanding lay saints and martyrs of the Covenant will warmly appeal. The two like-minded Archibalds, the only Marquis (and eighth Earl) of Argyll, and Johnston of Warristoun, walked hand in hand along the paths of piety that ultimately ended for both on the scaffold.

In the case of Argyll, chief of Clan Campbell, his " crooked mouth ", from which the clan derives its name, and his cross-eyes, to which he owed his nickname of the " gley-eyed Marquis ", give some indication of the completely crooked nature of his character whereby his real talents were prostituted. Morley calls him " a shifty and astute opportunist ". He was " intent above all things else on steering a safe course through the abounding perils of the time ": and allowed " his son Lorne to take part in Royalist risings whilst he himself kept up correspondence with Cromwell's generals ".

There was certainly no monotony in this noble's life, for it was one of constant trimming of sails. In one thing only was he consistent—in his shiftiness, for his whole life was a record of dishonesty, falsehood and intrigue, first on one side, then on the other. With the notable exception of his behaviour on the scaffold, he was courageous only in perpetrating cruelties and massacres indirectly through his clansmen, though when he had to face indictment of re-

sponsibility for these, he denied that he had either ordered or countenanced them. But in view of the secret instructions he gave for the burning of Forthar Castle, a seat of the uncovenanted Ogilvies, under circumstances which aggravated the act, little reliance can be placed on his denial of responsibility for other barbarities committed by his clansmen. A man of craft and subtilty, he was adept at making dupes and in using catspaws, so that he might escape the results of the Covenanted cruelties he himself had schemed.

In July 1640, Argyll sent a company from Forthar to a near-by house belonging to another Ogilvie (with whom the clan had been at feud) with an order to demolish it.[1] Finding only a sick gentlewoman, and a few servants in the house, the officer-in-charge returned to Argyll saying he could not destroy an unfortified private dwelling. But *Gillespuig Gruamach* (grim Archibald) angrily censured him for failing to obey orders, and sent him back to spoil the house with this pious admonition from the Psalms in Latin, *Abscendantur qui nos perturbant,* "Let those be cut off who trouble us", a favourite quotation of his.

It is perhaps not surprising that Argyll's gifts did not commend him even to his own clansmen; he had probably schemed with the Regicide for the King's murder; and it is characteristic of him he could only face Montrose from a safe distance—on his enemy's way to execution. Then the cart with the Royalist leader was stopped before the lodging where, amongst others, Argyll and Warristoun sat within, intent on

[1] His instructions to his lieutenant are extant



Photo Francis C Inglis, Edinburgh

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, 8TH EARL OF ARGYLL
1598–1661
" The Gley-Eyed Marquis "

From the Newbattle portrait
By kind permission of the Marquis of Lothian, C H

insulting their helpless foe. But a glance from Montrose promptly sent Argyll into retirement and out of sight of him. It is Argyll of whom, later, when he was on the scaffold, an admirer writes: "It is not too much to say that this sufferer seemed to be baptized into the forgiving ruth of Calvary, and that the younger brother reminds us in his more finite measure of the Elder, and His exceeding grace."

One can profitably compare the features of this man, *Gillespuig Gruamach*, martyr, with those of that supreme sinner, "Bluidy Clavers".

Of the other Archibald, likewise saint and martyr, the previous chapter has already afforded some glimpses. Warristoun was "a lawyer, pushful, persistent, tenacious, and not too scrupulous in tactics". "Obstinate and crack-brained", it was he who had been responsible for packing the General Assembly of 1638. He was "a deeply religious man, with a serene mind and mystical spirit", and "despite the defects of his impetuous nature and Border blood, he was one of the most sincere and devout upholders of the Reformed Faith in its Covenanted form."

The latest Prebyterian opinion of Warristoun is that he "was the real revolutionary, the germ of Robespierre, of Mazzini, of Lenin". He, like his twin, Argyll, cultivated treasonable intrigue for which he ultimately paid the penalty. Possibly an extract from his address to the Estates in 1644 illustrates just how "deeply religious" Warristoun was. He was inveighing against the delay in executing those who had been imprisoned for the sole crime of holding the King's Commission. Doubtless only fear of re-

prisals had stayed the hands of the godly, but he urged that this timidity " had provoked God's two great servants against them, the sword and plague of pestilence." It was thus essential that the God of the Covenanters should be placated with bloodshed.

A recent writer says this of one whom his diary proclaims to be a religious maniac. " Warristoun sometimes became a little impatient with his God, and the tone in which he addressed Him might almost be termed imperious." Others would stigmatize rather as blasphemous such a " prayer " as: " Wilt Thou be altogether unto me a Liar? "—a sentence extracted from Warristoun's " devotions ".

Whilst, as we have seen, Warristoun gloated with his comrade Argyll over Montrose's passage to execution, unlike the case of Argyll, the scaffold never supported a greater poltroon, who, in his efforts to escape the fate for which he had worked, pretended to be an idiot and fell on his face, " roaring " with tearful entreaties. Warristoun was hanged in 1663, and Argyll was executed two years previously—when, of course, the tide had turned against the Covenanters.

With these few examples of the ample provision made for the spiritual welfare of all sections of the community, it will now be realized what a perfect paradise Scotland had become under the sway of the Covenanters.

Chapter V

THE COVENANTERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES—AND SO DO "THE CURATES"

I

Leaving Covenanting hagiology for a while, the time has come for gathering something of the sweetness of its saints in "preaching up the times".

Naturally it is essential to "sit under" Samuel Rutherford, and opening his "Letters" at random, here is an extract from the page that was thus disclosed.

"Our Blessed Lord Jesus, who cannot get leave to sleep with His spouse in this land, is going to seek an inn where He will be better entertained. And what marvel? Wearied Jesus, after He hath travelled from Geneva, by the ministry of the worthy Mr. Knox, and was laid in His bed, and reformation begun, and the curtains drawn, had not gotten His dear eyes well together, when irreverent bishops came in, and with the din and noise of ceremonies, holy days, and other Romish corruptions, they awake our Beloved. Others came to His bedside, and drew the curtains, and put hands on His servants, banished, deprived and confined them; and for a pulpit they got a stool and a cold fire in the Blackness [Castle,] and the nobility drew the covering off Him, and have made Him a poor naked Christ, spoiling His servants

of the tithes and kirk rents. And now [1] there is such a noise of crying sins in the land, as the want of the knowledge of God, of mercy, and truth; such swearing, whoring, lying, and blood touching blood; that Christ is putting on His clothes, and making Him, like an ill-handled stranger, to go to other lands."

This extract, however, is scarcely typical of the indecent familiarity of the language, crude and repellent, that Rutherford invariably uses in speaking of Christ.

It will be remembered, however, that we have been told that this great saint of the Covenant "rises to a stature attained by only the select few . . . by a St. Bernard [2] . . ." How close is the resemblance will be shown by an extract of equal length taken from a volume of St. Bernard's letters, the extract being determined in precisely the same fashion as Rutherford's.

"Let none, therefore, doubt that he is loved who already loves. The love of God freely follows our love which it preceded. For how can He grow weary of returning their love to those whom He loved even while they yet loved Him not? He loved them, I say: yes, He loved. For as a pledge of His love thou hast the Spirit; thou hast also Jesus, the faithful witness, and Him crucified. Oh! double proof, and that most sure, of God's love towards us. Christ dies, and deserves to be loved by us. The Spirit works and makes Him to be loved. The One shows the reason

[1] This letter is dated July 21st, 1630, when the Covenanters were in power

[2] St Bernard the Great (1091–1174).

why He is loved: the Other how He is to be loved. The One commends His own great love to us; the Other makes it ours. In the One we see the object of love; from the Other we draw the power to love. With the One, therefore, is the cause; with the Other the gift of charity. What shame to watch, with thankless eyes, the Son of God dying—and yet this may easily happen, if the Spirit be not with us. But now, since *The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us* (Rom. v. 5) having been loved we love; and as we love, we deserve to be loved yet more. *For if*, says the Apostle, *while we were yet enemies, we have been reconciled to God through the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved through His life* (Rom. viii. 32). *For He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?"*

This extract is entirely typical of all St. Bernard's writings. " Knox defends Jewish barbarities in war, the extermination of conquered peoples, by asking: If God commanded, it is it not right? Alexander Shields, who is the most authoritative exponent of the Covenanting mind, justifies his reliance upon the Jewish scriptures on the ground that, though the New Testament does not enjoin assassination, revenge and hatred, it adopts them by its silence. In the one place he makes a valiant effort to find in the Lord's Prayer (Thy Kingdom come) authority for resisting, if necessary by assassination, the tyrant's claims ".

" The predilection of Shields for the Old Testament

is remarkable in one who was a Christian preacher. Opening his book *A Hind Let Loose* at random and noting the textual references, the following were the results:—On page 386, there are seventeen Old Testament references: from the New Testament none. On page 277, there are twelve Old Testament references: from the New Testament none. In the latter page he is claiming for (preaching) elders the fullest powers of life and death, cognizing of crimes, making and unmaking of Kings, for which the New Testament can hardly be appealed to". (Here again, are the claims of the Papacy repeated). "It was in the Hebrew Scriptures that the Covenanters found their Sabbath and their Fast Day,[1] their covenant, their intolerance and pharisaism."

There is a little book still to be picked up second-hand, called *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed,* published in 1693 by "Jacob Curate", and reputed to be the work of the Rev. Robert Calder, a Scottish Episcopalian priest; of whom fuller mention will be made later. Both caustic and very witty, this book quotes authentic extracts from Covenanting sermons, prayers, etc., and constitutes an invaluable compendium on the subject for those un-

[1] These, soon after 1600, became as far as abstention from food was concerned, purely farce days, the feature of which was, and still is in the Highlands, an orgy of preaching preparatory to the two annual communions. They are days of social excitement, when even non-Churchgoers abstain from work as "on Sabbath," and neighbours from a distance meet and are hospitably entertained from overflowing boards by those who live near the kirks Though these be full to hear the visiting ministers, always called in to assist, only a small proportion of the auditors are communicants—very few indeed amongst the Free Church and Free Presbyterians.

able—or indisposed—to wade through vast tomes, even were these generally accessible.

" Jacob Curate " says of his book that " Some may perhaps think this collection was published merely to render these puritans ridiculous; but 'tis plain enough to such as know them, that we have not made, but found them so. . . . Alas! 'tis but too, too evident what havoc and desolation these pretended reformers have made both in the church and state: God's name, honour, and worship are profaned; the Gospel exposed to the scorn and contempt of its enemies . . . the flood-gates of impiety and atheism are set open; the foundations of all true piety or policy are overturned; and all regard to things either sacred or civil quite destroyed ".

" Jacob Curate ", who was obviously a good and devout priest, truly concerned for the advancement of Christ's kingdom in Scotland, also observes that " An Ethiopian must be painted black and this is no fault of the painter ".

When pious Bishop Leighton was reproved for not " preaching up the times " (which meant stirring up revolt by topical political sermons,) he asked, " Who doth preach up the times? " When he was answered that all the brethren did it, he said " If all of you preach up the times, you may allow one poor brother to preach up Jesus Christ and eternity ". " Jacob Curate " says of the " Presbyterian pastors " that " They call peace, love, charity and justice, not gospel, but dry morality only. I once had great difficulty to convince one of [their people] that it was a sin for him to cheat and impose upon his neighbours in mat-

ters of trade, by concealing the faults of his goods from the buyer. He asked my reason: I told him, because he would not wish one to deal so with himself; " That is," said he again, " but morality; for if I shall believe in Christ I shall be saved." I asked him " Was not this Christ's saying, ' Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, that do you unto others? ' " ' Yes,' said he, ' that was good;' but that Christ, because of the hardness of the Jews' hearts spake very much morality with his gospel.' The poor man spoke as he was taught and bred in the conventicles."

The writer has had precisely the same experience of pious Presbyterians in the Highlands. With great professions of faith as " Christians ", in the cant sense, there is a complete absence of regard for Christ's own words: " Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven ". It is, in short, all profession and scant practice.

A covenanted Mr. Selkirk, preaching at Musselburgh said: " God sees no sins in His chosen. Now, Sirs, be you guilty of murder, adultery, bestiality, or any other gross sin, if you be of the election of grace, there is no fear of you, for God sees no sin in His chosen, Covenanted people ". Hence, " Jacob Curate " remarks: " To preach peace and righteous, though that be the the end of the Gospel, yet since it does not answer the design of the Covenant, it must be condemned as temporizing, time-serving, and the pleasing of men more than God, who, they are

sure, can never be pleased but in their covenanted way ".

In view of such teaching, it is no wonder that " Generally their conventicles produced very many bastards; and the excuse they made for that was, " Where sin abounds, the grace of God superabounds:[1] " there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ ". Sometimes this, " That lambs of Christ may sport together; to the pure all things are pure ". Nay, generally they are of opinion, that a man is never a true saint, till we have found a fall, such as David's with Bathsheba." Such a sentiment as this, with many another in the book, shows marked affinity with the teaching of the so-called " New Morality ". A certain school of modern writers, too, would be delighted with the blasphemies and obscenities with which these Covenanting sermons abound. Where they are not blasphemous, they are profane; if they just escape obscenities, they are indecent, so that no one reverencing Christian morality would soil the pages of another book by making such quotations from them.

II

At best the Covenanting preaching contained much that was coarse and irreverent, and most of the sermon, says " Jacob Curate " are " nonsensical raptures, the abuse of mystic divinity . . . often times stuffed with impertinent and base similies, and always with homely, coarse, and ridiculous expressions,

[1] This is akin to, if not identical with, Luther's teaching.

very unsuitable to the gravity and solemnity that becomes divinity ". Indeed, the so-called " mystical " sermons substitute for the holy fear and profound reverence of the Catholic mystics, a vulgar, sometimes an actually besotted, familiarity with the most sacred subjects.

Contrast one of the least offensive " mystical " raptures of Rutherford, the adulterer, with the true mysticism of St. Bernard. To the former class, " Jacob Curate " refers as " this extraordinary way of preaching and praying, which they think an excellency and perfection, and call it a holy familiarity with God, and a peculiar privilege of the most refined saints ".

In a letter to Lady Kenmure, Rutherford writes: " Madam, why should I smother Christ's honesty? He looked strange and uncouth-like upon me when I came just here; but I believe himself better than his looks. I shall not again quarrel with Christ for a frown. Now he hath taken the mask off his face, and saith, Kiss thy fill. . . . 'Tis little to talk of Christ by the book and tongue but to come nigh Christ, and hug him and embrace him, is another thing ".

St. Bernard, in one of his sublime sermons on " The Song of Songs " where he speaks of " What it is to kiss the feet, the hands, the lips of the Lord ", says: " Let not a soul then which is laden with sin, still subject to the passions of the flesh, which has not yet tasted the delights of the Holy Spirit . . . in short a soul, like mine make the least pretensions to such a degree of grace ". . . . But, " having then imprinted this first kiss upon the Feet do not presume immed-

iately to lift up thyself to the kiss of His Lips, but let the kiss of His Hand be for thee a gradation or second step by which to reach the higher blessedness . . . . If Jesus shall have said to me " Thy sins are forgiven thee ", what shall even this avail me, if I do not cease to commit sin? If I have put off my tunic and put it on again, what doth it profit? Or if I wash my feet and defile them anew, will it avail anything that they were once washed? "

Papalists, when they base their case for Papal supremacy on the Petrine text, at least cannot be accused of wresting Scripture to their purpose, whatever fault may be found with their exegesis. But the Covenanters made no difficulty in twisting a line in the most solemn passages of the Gospels to suit themselves. A Mr. David Williamson, a noted minister, preached before Parliament on Psalm ii. 10 and he gave expression to this shocking blasphemy: " 'Tis no light matter, 'tis an ordinance of God, the royal diadem of Christ; he was a martyr on this head, for it was his ditty on the cross, John xix. 19, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*. If this scripture do not prove that Christ died a martyr for Scotch Presbytery, I am sure there's no other place, either in Scripture or antiquity that will ".

After this, it is not surprising to hear that the daughter of a Fife Presbyterian preacher took it upon herself to revise her New Testament by replacing " Presbyterian " in place of " Bishop " in the verse where St. Peter speaks of Christ as the Bishop of our souls.

Who dare talk of Romanists perverting the Scrip-

tures in face of Covenanting accomplishment in this respect? An Act of the General Assembly, August 13, 1650 actually declares that: " Though our Saviour told His disciples that His Kingdom was not of this world, and that therefore they ought not to fight for Him; yet that doctrine does not now oblige Covenanted Christians, for they may fight without, yea against, the consent of the supreme magistrate for the cause of God; and a probable capacity to effectuate their designs, is the call of God to do it ". And a Mr. William Moncrief, preaching in the Kirk of Largo, Fife, said: " But ye'll say to me, Sirs, that Christ desired us to love our enemies. That is true indeed: but there is no word of God's enemies there; mark that, beloved, tho' we love our own enemies, yet we are bound to hate God's enemies; that is, all the enemies of the Covenanting cause ".

It is impossible to quote various blasphemies and profanities of the Covenanting ministers when they dispensed Communion to their " slashing communicants ", but this incident of another Sacrament may be menioned. One Mr. Murray, marrying a couple, called the man " the head " and the woman " the tail ". " In the name of God, then," says he, " I join head and tail together, Sirs, let no man ever separate them ".

Mr. Robert Blair, the famous colleague of Rutherford at St. Andrew's, " was very much thought of for his familiar way of preaching. He preached often against observance of Christmas, and said once in a Scotch jingle: " You will say, Sirs, good old Yool Day (Christmas); I'll tell you, good old Fool Day;

you will say it is a brave holiday; I tell you it is brave Belly-day". Another preacher, Mr. Matthew Selkirk, declared "They that keep Yool Day, Sirs, deny that Christ came in the flesh, and are rank Jews, and they keep that day in commemoration of Julius Cæsar, the chief of the Jews".

Another preacher railing against bishops, expressed himself thus: "Sirs, at the day of judgment, Christ will call the prelates, and He will call one of the falsest knaves first, and say 'Come hither, sirrah! (he will not call him my lord), do you remember how you put out such a sweet saint of mine on such and such a day? Sirrah! Do you mind how you persecuted one of my precious saints that was preaching my word? Come, come sirrah, stand there at my left hand: thou and the Devil shall go together even now.'"

It is not surprising that those who could speak with the utmost blasphemy of the origin of the Lord's Prayer, and made the use of it one of their chief charges against Episcopalians, should pray in very different manner from the Divine model. Many of the Covenanting prayers are too profane and farcical to quote by anyone with a sense of decency, not to mention reverence, but perhaps three may be given. The first was the extemporization of a notorious field preacher and rebel, the Reverend John Welsh. He prayed thus:—"Lord, we are come hither, a pack of poor beggars of us the day: Alms to the poor blind here, for God's sake, that never saw the light of the gospel; alms to the poor deaf here, that never heard the joyful sound; to the poor cripples, that have their

legs, the covenant, broken by the bishops. Lord, pity thy poor Kirk, the day, poor woman! Sad is she, Lord, send her a lift, and God confound that filthy bitch, that gum-gall'd whore, the whore of Babylon". One Mr. Hurston said: "Lord, give us grace; for if thou give us not grace, we shall not give thee glory; and who will win by that, Lord?"

A celebrated preacher, Mr. Areskine, praying at the Tron Kirk, Edinburgh, said "Lord, have mercy on all fools and idiots and particularly on the magistrates of Edinburgh".

After these quotations "Jacob Curate" has perhaps some justification for remarking of the Covenanters that: "They have their souls cast in a different mould from all the Christians in the world. There is no church but they differ from, both in worship and practice".

In the Lowlands, and notably amongst the poorer people of Glasgow, one can still see the results of Covenanting preaching in general irreverence and disregard for holy things: in the license they mistake for liberty; in the rudeness they think expresses their independence, in dourness, and in coarseness of expression. But the most striking affinity with the Covenanters was disclosed in a case tried before the High Court of Justiciary in Glasgow, and reported in the *Glasgow Herald* of May 1st, 1934, just as this was being written.

A man, John Traquair, was sentenced to four years' penal servitude for mobbing and rioting, and assaulting two men, passengers in a train, by slashing the arm of one with a razor, and striking the other in the

face and body at Bridgeton Cross station, Glasgow. Both the victims of these assaults were opening the door to let four passengers in, when Traquair, one of a mob on the platform, " shouting filthy expressions ", and armed with stones and worse weapons, dashed into the compartment and fell upon the two men. A constable stated that Traquair was one of a gang known as " Billy Boys " who " were known for their religious views. Sometimes [as in this case] they engaged in conflict with persons of the Roman Catholic faith, and caused a considerable amount of trouble." Cross-examined, this witness stated " he assumed that the Billy Boys called themselves by that name because they regarded themselves as followers of William of Orange." The guard of the train, asked what was shouted, replied that they were " religious remarks ". The Advocate-Depute then observed, " I do not suppose they were very religious: but let us have them," to which the witness answered: " To — with the — Papists !"

A detective officer stated that this so-called Orange organization was one of four gangs of whom the residents were in terror, so much so that it was impossible to obtain evidence against the ruffians.

In the Presbyterian Highlands such behaviour is unknown, but a breach of the seventh commandment is thought nothing of, although if there is the slightest infringement of the fourth commandment (but only as affecting the Seventh Day) interpreted wholly on Jewish lines, holy hands (and possibly some adulterous ones) are held up in horror at the profanation of " the Sabbath ".

At the end of "Jacob Curate's" book, there is a witty *Short Catechism for the Instruction of Young and Old* from which these extracts are taken:—

Question: Are the Presbyterians Christians?

Answer: Yes.

Q.: How do you make that appear?

A.: Because they abound in charity.

Q.: Wherein does their charity consist?

A.: In loving their enemies.

Q.: Who are their enemies?

A.: The Devil, the World and the Flesh.

Q.: Why do not the Presbyterians say the Creed and the Doxology?

A.: Because they are not word by word in Scripture.

Q.: Why do they not say the Lord's Prayer?

A.: Because it is word by word in Scripture.

Q.: What is the sad effect of the want of a form in a church?

A.: It is just as it was said of the earth, Gen. I. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the earth.

Q.: What Scripture have the Presbyterians for not observing a form?

A.: 2 Tim. I. 13. Hold fast the form of sound words.

III

The Restoration of the Monarchy soon followed upon the death of the regicidal Usurper, and then the tables were turned, for the reign of the Covenanted

Saints came to an end. In the time of their supremacy, they had sown a plentiful crop of the seeds of rebellion and they were to reap exactly what they had sown. Curiously enough, whilst they had revelled in the sowing, they inaugurated and sustained the first advertisement campaign in Britain by ceaselessly trumpeting the wickedness and cruelty of their successors in actually forcing them to reap their own crop. This advertisement campaign of the Covenanters is successfully continued to this day.

Despite the violent suppression to which they were subjected, and which had silenced them, those who were in favour of Episcopal government had not been annihilated. Indeed, Douglas, the Presbyterian leader, surprisingly wrote to Sharp, later Archbishop of St. Andrew's, in 1660, "that a generation had arisen in Scotland unacquainted with the work of the Reformation, and consequently disposed to condemn even the Covenant itself, to which they bore a heart-hatred", and that "the generality of this new upstart generation have no love to Presbyterial government but are wearied of that yoke, feeding themselves with fancy of Episcopacy or moderate Episcopacy".

Could it be that this was the result of any defects in the administration of the Covenanted Saints? Miss Cunningham, however, says in her *Loyal Clans:* "Their conduct of politics and war fell deplorably below the common level. They boasted of applying Christian principles to politics, and thought that God's service justified them in doing that which was right in their own eyes, without the restraints of humanity or honour. Shielding their lack of scruple

under the name of Christ, they brought all religion and morality into contempt, and paved the way for the shameless laxity of their successors. They made the hardest possible bargains, and when things turned out ill, disowned their obligations, in spirit if not in letter." Later, she says: "The claims which the Covenanters advanced on behalf of the Church against the State were no less sweeping than those of the Pope himself, and their principles were commonly identified with the subversive doctrines propagated by the Jesuits, against which the Divine Right of Kings had developed in defence of the civil power. John Maxwell, Bishop of Ross (in the reign of Charles I) had published an "Epistle congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor of the Society of Jesus, to the Covenanters in Scotland".

Whether it was that the Scots wished to be delivered from the Covenanted Papal tyranny or not, the fact remains that in 1661 Parliament passed, almost unanimously, the Recissory Act. This repealed all the Covenanting legislation of the past twenty-three years, thus exactly paralleling the doings of the packed Assembly of 1638, and therefore reverting to a reinstatement of Episcopacy. This, however, amounted to little more than the headship of bishops over the presbyteries.

Of the 1662 Episcopacy, a historian writes: "In the North, ministers and people settled down under the form of government which most of them preferred: in the South and West, a strong Presbyterian party, including all the protestors, held out against the King's policy. These worthy men figure in our

popular books as champions of liberty; but a man's love of liberty should be measured by what he concedes to others, not by what he claims for himself. They held, as firmly as their opponents, to the principle of uniformity; they looked forward to a happy time when neither Papist or sectary should be allowed to breathe the air of Scotland. . . . Those ministers who would not now comply were flung out as ruthlessly as Henderson and his friends had flung out those who opposed the Covenant. They were silenced unless they could evade the law by addressing meetings in houses or in the open air. These conventicles, as they were called, were now to be suppressed, just as the Presbytery when in power had suppressed 'private meetings'."

It is a great mistake completely to identify the Restoration government with the Episcopal Church in the way in which, when the Covenanters were dominant, the Kirk and the government, "one and indivisible", were indeed identical. The frequent divergences between Church and Government at and after the Restoration is demonstrated by the fact that the absurd and self-contradictory Test Act, against which the Covenanters so furiously raged, was equally, and with much more reason, repugnant to the Episcopalian clergy. Indeed, the Bishop of Aberdeen drew up a reasoned argument against its ridiculous and inconsistent provisions, and his clergy joined him in his protest.

Again, the Episcopal clergy, unlike the Covenanting ministers, did not carry a sword as a badge of their sacred office. Only sometimes did they resort to

a weapon in self-defence, when the godly, fully armed, invaded their homes, and threatened the lives of their wives and children as well as their own. Nor did their ranks include any who considered it part of their pastoral duty themselves to urge on others to slay and spare not, like the Rev. John Nevay. On the contrary. After the battle of Rullion in 1666, there were bishops and clergy who petitioned for the lives of Covenanting prisoners. Amongst the former were Wishart and Paterson, who strove for the lives even of violent young rebels like Renwick on the ground that they had been led astray. Wishart, returning good for evil, sent daily supplies from his own table to the prisoners. Even the arch-fiend Sharp has similar pleas for sparing the lives of Covenanters to his credit [1]. Can the same be said truthfully of a single Covenanting minister as regards Episcopalian, or even Royalist, prisoners, though, in Charles I's reign Alexander Henderson, minister of Edinburgh, had been kind to some?

Yet Covenanting story-tellers, like the saints they champion, invariably represent themselves as ensconced in an impregnable fortress. So they begin to hurl stones fast and furiously—not at the Government which deserves them in most instances—but at Episcopacy, which, as a whole, rarely deserves them. So their stones are as boomerangs, and instead of returning harmlessly against granite walls, lo, they go crashing through the glass house that prove to be the Covenanting company's only shelter. The missile directed at the enactments of the Parliament of 1663,

[1] See back pp. 78, 155.

and later ones, designed to put down rebellious Covenanters as a menace to the public peace, find their billets in the repressive legislation directed against peaceful Episcopalian clergy, and more panes fall in splinters. The showers of stones furiously hurled against the Test and other coercive Acts, merely shiver into fragments the stained-glass windows depicting the enforcement of Covenanting idol-worship upon everyone.

It was a case all the way round of the iron kettle calling the aluminium pot black, and an ignoring of the fact that what was sauce for the Episcopalian goose was sauce for the Covenanting gander.

In addition to their other misdemeanours, the Covenanters were actually intriguing with Holland (against whom the country was at war) in July 1666. Holland promised the traitors a large subsidy, with assistance, arms and ammunition, when the Covenanting plot succeeded. Though a fleet of forty sail Dutch at Dunbar was reported, no landing was apparently attempted.

The Government of Scotland throughout the reign of Charles II, if not of James VII as well, was contemptible, and most of its ministers devoid of any capacity whatsoever to govern. Their policy was characterized by vacillation, alternating between displays of weakness and of severity towards the rebels with whom they had to deal and from whose ranks most of them had, for the basest of reasons, deserted.

"Set a thief to catch a thief" in this case proved a disastrous failure which no upright person can possibly deplore, however much they may feel that

there could be no peace in unhappy Scotland until the turbulent Covenanters, incapable of being taught, were repressed by the sternest measures. But this was another matter from leaving Scotland at the mercy of unscrupulous self-seekers, who, trained in the Covenanting school of " slay and spare not ", brought over to the King's disservice their merciless Covenanting spirit to bear against their former colleagues, and still their co-religionists. Of such renegades who thus sought position and power were Middleton, a soldier of fortune, but the best of the company: Rothes, a sensualist and drunkard: and worst of all Lauderdale, loose and filthy in his life, and of violent temper. This man, a product, be it always remembered, of the Covenant, became the virtual governor of Scotland, and he and his ex-Covenanting colleagues never ceased in their hatred of Episcopacy. Indeed, Lauderdale played off the bishops against the Presbyterian nobility, the double game having as its object at once the defamation and harrying of the bishops and the irritating of the Presbyterians. Yet, to advance themselves, these of the new nobility allied themselves with Episcopacy and legislated against their Covenanted brethren amongst whom was still their own proper place.

In a class quite apart from these was their colleague the so-called " Bluidy Mackenzie ". " George Mackenzie [of Rosehaugh] was an enlightened man, who did much to remove the more barbarous features of our law. He was also a religious man, or at least deeply interested in religion: his sympathy with the Quakers indicates the line which a thoughtful layman

might be disposed to take in that age of controversy ".

Most, if not all, Episcopalians will be in agreement with Presbyterians in considering James Sharp, who became Archbishop of St. Andrew's, a Judas. But again, it must be remembered, he was a product of the Covenants, and like the laymen before mentioned (with whom he was allied) it is plainly a case of the leopard being unable to change his spots. But his betrayal of Presbyteriansm was as nothing to his betrayal of the Church he so unfortunately entered, and of which, to gratify his personal ambition, he became an Archbishop, only to sell her by his public conduct, both base and detestable in many ways. His private life, however, unlike that of those of his colleagues who still remained Presbyterians, was unimpeachable, although it is the Covenanting way to misrepresent him as wholly evil.

It is customary to divide the Covenanters into moderates and extremists.[1] But there was no moderation whatever, as has been shown, in the Covenanters themselves, and in the day of their power, violence characterized all Covenanters.

Those ejected Covenanting ministers who, after the Restoration, accepted Indulgences—the weak compromises of a fatuous Government—by this act abnegated Covenanting principles. For the Indulgences required them to accept collation at the

[1] These " extremists " are, by Covenanting apologists, limited to the Cameronians, Gibbites, etc , at the close of the Covenanting period But were the fighters at Bothwell, the Rev. John Nevay, etc , and the Covenanters of the first generation really less extreme?

bishop's hands that they might resume preaching in their old, or another, parish.

The Covenant, on the other hand, bound them to extirpate Prelacy. Naturally then, the "extremists", or continuing Covenanters, completely disowned these temporizers, whilst conscientious and consistent Episcopalians properly condemned the Indulgences as Erastian encroachments upon Episcopal rights.

So far, then, was the Government from being identified with Episcopacy as it is invariably represented to be by Covenanting writers. The concern of the Government was to put an end to a dangerous rebellion, without consideration of thereby advancing the cause of Episcopacy, in which it had little interest as a system, and certainly none as a religion, and merely sought to use as a cat's paw.

It requires no sympathy for Covenanters to abhor and execrate the tortures to which several of the rebel ringleaders were subjected. But at least there is reason for thankfulness that the boot and thumbscrew were not earlier introduced into Scotland. For in the hands of the ruthless saints, egged on by such faithful ministers as John Nevay, there would inevitably have been a hundredfold more victims of these cruel inventions of the fiend.

IV

In 1690, there was printed in London, by the order of the ever-patriotic General Assembly, a book by a Dr. Rule, called *A Brief True Account of the Sufferings of the Kirk of Scotland* (that is, Covenanted

Presbyterianism) *Occasioned by the Episcopalians Since the Year* 1660. In the preface, this gentleman states: " I have treated the adversaries I deal with as brethren, desiring rather to exceed, than to come short in civility and fair dealing with them."

Thus it is that this doctor of medicine writes of Episcopalians: " Oh! their superlative impudence, their hellish dissimulation and malice! They imitate the devil himself, who first tempts and then accuses, though it is too visible that their consciences are past feeling, being seared as with a hot iron. When their Hierarchy was restored, the devil, who seemed to be bound sometime before, was let loose, the flood-gates of all impiety and wickedness were set open, and hell did triumph in its conquest over the nation, and displayed its banners not only against religion but even morality." Again, and " these are the sweetest flowers of . . . (his) rhetoric," says " Jacob Curate ", quoting Dr. Rule's book on the Episcopalians: " They are Godless miscreants, of the true Egyptian brood, infamous paracides, sorcerers, and incestuouse apostates: infamous varlets, infamous villains, left to corrode their own viperous . . . . with their inhuman fury; the devil's instruments, fit only to be stallions and pimps to baudy houses [1]; Episcopalian hireling preachers with their infernal bawlings, the scum and refuse of the nation; they bear the charac-

[1] In view of the fact that this charge (with variations of expressing it even more grossly) is indiscriminately made against bishops and curates in general by eighteenth-century Presbyterian writers, it has been thought essential to include it here to evidence their utter lack of scruple Not the most devout bishop or curate was exempt from these foul slanders.

ter of wickedness on their foreheads, liker pagans than professors, blood-hounds, children of hell, the tyranno papa prelatical host, the great papa prelatical champion of Dundee: savage beasts in human shape . . . the generation of vipers, the Episcopalian seed of the serpent, hectors, and buffoons, the most obdurate, impenitent, spiteful, base, impudent priests, whose fathers were not good enough to eat with the dogs of their flocks,'' etc. There is more, much more, of such pretty "civilities", but even "fair dealings" can be overdone, especially when there is constant repetition in them.

To show the reverse of all this, we must revert to two or three more references to Covenanting hagiology. Let the first be one picked out by Patrick Walker, a contemporary writer, to form one in his galaxy of *Six Saints of the Covenant.* This "singular" saint, to use the common Covenanting phrase was John Semple, minister of Carsphairn, in Kirkcudbrightshire, predecessor of a curate of the parish to be mentioned later. Walker tells us that, "After the unhappy Restoration and establishment of Prelacy, his zeal was so great and flaming against bishops and their underlings that, wherever he was, and whoever were his hearers, great or small, he could never read and explain any portion of Scripture but he found bishops and their underlings, and somewhat in it against them; even in the beginning of Genesis, the account of the whole creation, but not one word that God created bishops (as such) and from that he inferred that they were none of God's creatures.''

From this arresting and novel piece of Biblical exegesis, giving some further idea of the gospel-preaching on which the later Covenanters were fed, one naturally passes on to scenes that show them in action. At the same time some idea can be obtained of the state of affairs, and of the very "singular saints" with whom Claverhouse, the subject of the next chapter, was called upon to deal.

Of these particular saints, Walker, who was probably a pedlar, and therefore well qualified to speak, says: "Such a succession of earnest contenders and faithful witnesses [there were] through so many ages that none have succeeded them since the apostles went off the stage." Two of Walker's "earnest contenders", followed by the last to suffer for his treasonable rebellion, will now appear in the following scene.

At the town cross of Sanquhar, Dumfriesshire, two ministers of the strictest sect of the Covenanters and some twenty followers met on June 22nd, 1680. The ministers were Richard Cameron (1648–80), founder of the Cameronian sect, or "hillmen", afterwards to become the Cameronian regiment; and Donald Cargill (1619–81). Of the latter we read that he "was the surviving representative of the ministry uncontaminated by defections, the last veteran able to bear aloft the banner of the Covenanted Church. He considered his solitariness no barrier to him in exercising his spiritual functions as the *ultimus judex* in the land, willing to act constitutionally in excommunicating the enemies of Christ's Church." This self-selected Pope of the Covenant had probably

drafted what was called the *Queensferry Paper*, and on this was based *The Declaration and Testimony of the True Presbyterian anti-Prelatik and anti-Erastian Persecuted Party in Scotland.*

After a psalm and a prayer this remarkable document was affixed to the cross. The lengthy disquisition contains these truly pontifical pronouncements: "Though we be for government and governors, such as the word of God and our Covenant allows, yet we for ourselves and all that will adhere to us, as the representatives of the true Presbyterian kirk and covenanted nation of Scotland, considering the great hazard of lying under such a sin any longer, do, by this presents, disown Charles Stuart. . . . We, being under the Standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of Salvation, DO DECLARE WAR with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ, and his cause and Covenants; and against all such as have strengthened him, sided with, or in any way acknowledged him in his tyranny, civil or ecclesiastic. . . . And to conclude, we hope after this none will blame us for, or offend at, *our rewarding those that are against us*, as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity."

Of these Christian sentiments, an admirer's remark is: "They set aside despotism, in order to establish a theocracy. . . . The Cameronians . . . were simply translating into act, the wholesome patriotism of John Knox." Another asks: "What had they done? They had cast off the authority of their monarch. But they had not done it in mischevous

anarchy and blatant revolt. They made their abjuration a religious act. They prefaced and followed the oath of insurrection by the worship of God. Moreover, they had disavowed King Charles in the interest of King Jesus." The same authority, still speaking of the Declaration, adds, it is interesting to note: "Its principles triumphed in 1688." A month later, Cameron, in his exercise of the prime duty of a Covenanted minister, fell leading a hundred of his saints into a skirmish at Airds Moss, and then "fought desperately but calmly as one who enjoys the strife"—like a true pastor of the Covenant.

Donald Cargill was now left alone in all his Papal glory. "In September 1680 (he) convened a conventicle at Torwood, Stirlingshire, and preached from the text, Ezekiel xxi. 25: 'And thou, profane wicked Prince of Israel, whose day is come', also from 1 Corinthians v. 13: 'But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from yourselves that wicked person', and Lamentations iii. 32.

Investing himself with the office of a prophet . . . Cargill assured his hearers that he knew the mind of God, and had a clear call for doing on earth what was approved in heaven. . . . Cargill solemnly said: "I, being a minister of Jesus Christ, and having authority and power from Him, do, in His Name and by His Spirit, cast out of the true Church and deliver up to Satan, Charles II, King," etc., for reasons which were tabulated under seven heads. Continuing to speak *ex cathedra*, as supreme pontiff, "Blest Cargill" continued in the congenial work of excommunication,

including the Duke of York (afterwards James VII), Monmouth, Lauderdale, and Rothes, *but not*, most strange omission, *John Graham of Claverhouse.*

V

These remarkable examples of Covenanted Christianity inspired another to take up the vacant leadership. For " Blest Cargill " had paid the penalty of the gallows for indoctrinating the people with his popish dogma of the Covenanting Vicar of Christ being above and beyond the State in the legitimate exercise of his functions in the State. So there stepped forward James Renwick (1662–1688), of whom an authority declares, " he, as much as any other, embodied the genius of the Covenant ". This is how he did it.

Renwick was a highly educated man who became famous as a field preacher, and eager to emulate Cargill, he, too, went to Sanquhar, with still another declaration. This was in October 1684, when the more select of the Covenanted had formed themselves into " Society men ". So, despite Renwick's authorship, this document was originally entitled *The Society of People's Declaration, especially against Informers and Intelligencers*. Now it is commonly known as Renwick's Declaration.[1]

[1] A yet further declaration " The Protestation and Apologetical Admonitory Declaration of the True Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland against the proclaiming of James, Duke of York, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, etc., was published on May 28th, 1685, again at Sanquhar. To commemorate these admirable declarations, the Presby-

After being nailed to the cross at Sanquhar, it was ordered to be affixed on November 8th to all market crosses and church doors throughout the rebellious country—Galloway, and the counties of Ayr, Lanark, and Dumfries. This declaration piously disclaimed "that hellish principle of killing all who differ in judgment from them", then proceeds: "we have disowned the authority of Charles Stuart and all authority depending upon him", and "have declared war against him and his accomplices". In consequence, "all, that whosoever stretches forth their hand against us by shedding our blood . . . or by obeying such commands . . . or who deliver any of us into their hands by the spilling of our blood . . . informers . . . such as viperous and malicious bishops and curates . . . who raise the hue and cry after us . . . we say . . . shall be reputed by us enemies to God and the Covenanted work of reformation, and punished as such according to our power and the degree of their offence".

The comprehension of the Declaration reflects great praise on Renwick: he specifies no less than thirteen holders of various offices and commissions, as well as several classes of persons who come under the ban. A champion writes of this *Society of People's Declaration*: "Theirs was a re-announcement of the opinions of Knox and his successors a century bygone; and the tone of the manifesto is less virulent

---

terian townsmen of Sanquhar in 1860 proudly erected a grey granite monument on the site of the old town cross, and refer to the two first proclamations as "witnessing the usurpation of the government by James VII".

than was to be expected from firebrands whom the Lord Advocate [Mackenzie] styled ' devils and wild-cats '."

To revert to Renwick. The same admirer, after relating how he went into Edinburgh to stay with a man whose " house was a rendezvous of Covenanters where treasonable papers were safely kept," states that excisemen came to arrest the fighting pastor. Renwick, " pistol in hand, cleared a way for himself and friends, but at last he was caught with an exculpating (*sic*) diary on him. The Council examined him and found him an irreconcilable opponent of the King and his Government." At his trial by judge and jury, Renwick " justified his principles and confession that the King was no longer lawful sovereign, etc., etc., so he was condemned to execution ". Bishop Paterson, Dr. Munroe, and other influential Episcopalians, visited Renwick in prison, for Paterson thought him " a pretty lad and would fain have him reprieved ". " The Lord Advocate Dalrymple personally tried to save him by endeavouring to procure from him some acknowledgment of the King's authority." In fact, all sorts and conditions of men, including Presbyterians, tried to save him. But no considerations whatsoever would induce Renwick to budge one iota from his treasonable principles, and for these he was executed unflinchingly. He was " the offering of an almost spotless victim to the insatiable Moloch who sat on the throne ".

We have now to go back from 1688, the date of Renwick's execution, to the immediate consequences of his declaration of 1684. " Armed bands grew bold

in the south-west and broke into Isle Tower, on Nithside, the residence of the Depute-Sheriff of Kirkcudbright; and November 16th, a band of over a hundred persons broke open and emptied the prison in Kirkcudbright and killing the sentry at Tolbooth."

On November 20th, "two gentlemen of the Lifeguards", married and with children, and quartered at Suin Abbey in West Lothian, were murdered in their beds at night. Murdered, too, was the Rev. Peter Pearson, M.A., who had boasted that he was not afraid of the Whigs[1]: boldly maintained that Papists were better subjects than Presbyterians: preached anti-Calvinistic doctrines: and fulfilled the duty imposed upon him by law of accusing, or excusing, his parishioners in respect of rebellion. He was shot dead in his manse, also at night, in November 1684, by a rebel parishioner.

It was to meet the situation thus created that the Council took action in respect of all men and women over 16 living in the Capital, or anywhere within the dioceses of Glasgow and Galloway, as comprising the whole of the affected areas. The Council, on Dec. 30th, 1684, proclaimed: "We hereby command and require all our subjects . . . not to presume to travel without testificates of their loyalty and good principles."

[1] This term, short for Whiggamore, was originally applied to the Covenanters There is considerable dispute as to its first meaning, some deriving it from the term used in Ayrshire, a great Covenanting county, for the sour water that is run off from the milk before it is churned, and others to the words used in the S W counties by the drovers to their horses on their way to Leith for corn.

Then followed the famous Abjuration Oath which all were required to take, and all military men were authorized to minister. The terms of this oath in full were as follows:

> I, A.B., do hereby abhor, renounce, and disown, in the presence of the Almighty God, the pretended Declaration of War lately affixed at several parish churches, in so far as it declared war against his sacred Majesty, and asserts that it is lawful to kill such as serve his Majesty in Church, State, Army, or Country or such as act against the authors of the pretended Declaration now shown me. And I do hereby utterly renounce and disown the villainous authors * thereof who did, as they call it, statute and ordain the same, and what is therein mentioned. And I swear I shall never assist the authors of the said pretended Declaration, or their emissaries or adherents in any point of punishing, killing, or making of war, any manner of way, as I shall answer to God.

Such are the actual words of this oath, which only one Covenanting writer has ever quoted, and then stopped at the point marked *. This same gentleman says of this "soul-insulting" oath that it "made its swearer own the Church to be a department of the State". This, however, is quite the mildest of the misrepresentations of this document which has met, perhaps, more unscrupulous abuse than any other affecting Covenanters.

In 1662, the Covenants had, at last, been declared illegal: in 1685, they were declared treasonable, with the pains of treason attached to those who actively maintained them.

These facts of history provide the background against which John Graham of Claverhouse, the subject of the next chapter, first appears. In that chapter itself it seems best to give the later background which forms his principal setting—when he was administrator of the Abjuration Oath and last Conventicle Act.

VI

Towards the end of Chapter III, something has already been said of the " rabbling of the curates ", in which rabblings their wives and families were invariably included. These took place as soon as the news came of the landing of William of Orange. In view of what the Covenanted ministers taught their worshipping followers concerning the curates, they were certainly the " strike-a-lights " who lit in these followers the fire of fanaticism against the curates. That " lean and fanatical " saint, James Guthrie, already referred to, had an equally famous saint for cousin, the " precious " William Guthrie, minister of Fenwick. In one of his printed sermons, full of curses and imprecations, this is a sample of his exclamations: " Will ye gang, man, to the cursed curates? Gang, and the vengeance of God gang with thee: the cursed curates bid us side with them: the devil rugg [tear] their hearts out of their sides."

Mr. John Dickson, accounted another very pious saint, preaching in a meeting-house at Kelso, said: " Ask any old dying wife if she had any evidence of salvation? She will tell you, I hope so; for I believe the Apostles' Creed, I am taken with the Lord's

Prayer, and I know my duty to be the Ten Commandments. But I tell you, sirs, these are but old rotten wheelbarrows to carry souls to hell. These are idols that the false prelates and curates have set up to obstruct the Covenant and the work of God in the land."

Alexander Shields, that most representative of all the Covenanters, as we have heard, in his book, *The Hind Let Loose*, thus writes of the curates: "Never can it be instanced these twenty-seven years, that the curates have brought one soul to Christ, but many instances may be given of their murdering souls. Hence these who cannot be but soul-murderers, may not be heard or entertained as soul-physicians." Again: "The meeting of the curates, for administration of ordinances in their way, the Lord hates, and hath signally forsaken, therefore we should hate and forsake them." Finally: "Hearing of curates reductively, involves us under the guilt of idolatry, and breach of the second Commandment [Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, etc.]; therefore we ought not to let them dwell in the land, lest they make us sin. Exodus xxiii. 33. We should destroy their very names out of the place. Deut. xii. 13. Judges ii. 7."

The most blasphemous of all the Covenanting disparagements of the Lord's Prayer cannot be repeated here: as a "set prayer" they could not, and did not, use it, considering their own pious effusions far superior. When James Kirton, one of the "precious" preachers, was asked by an Edinburgh magistrate, "why did they forbear the public use of

the Lord's Prayer," he was answered downright, "because it was the badge of the Episcopal worship."

Two instances of how the curates conducted themselves when they were rabbled by the organized bands of saints, will afford a comparison with the conduct of Covenanted ministers.

The Rev. Robert Bell was curate of Kilmarnock, Ayrshire, and on December 16th, 1688, this is what befell him. On his way to celebrate a marriage in the neighbouring church of Riccarton, in the absence of the parish priest, he was seized by two armed men, members of a large party seen in the distance. Having a musket presented at his head, Mr. Bell was taken in custody by the two armed men and roundly abused. When he asked the commander of the party by what rule or law they proceeded, he was answered: "By the rule and law of the Solemn League and Covenant; by which we are obliged to extirpate prelacy, and bring all malignants to condign punishment." The "soul-killing" curate thereupon observed they would do better to justify their proceedings by the Word of God, and the practice of Christ, His Apostles and the primitive Church in the propagation of the Christian religion. But the spokesman of the Covenant replied "that the doom of all malignants is clearly set down in the Word of God", and that the appearance of himself and his fellows "thus in arms, was conformable to the practice of the ancient Church of Scotland"—this "ancient Church" just dating, of course, from 1560.

Carried prisoner to Kilmarnock, Mr. Bell was met

by the Laird of Bridgehouse, who courageously told his captors, amongst other things, that their conduct constituted " insolent outrages against all the law of the nation ". They ordered the Laird to " stand off, and forbear giving rules to us, for we will take none from you, nor from any man, nor will we adhere to the Prince of Orange, nor the law of the kingdom, any further than the Solemn League and Covenant was fulfilled by both." When they reached Kilmarnock, they threatened to throw Mr. Bell into the river, and next, one of them demanded if he had a Book of Common Prayer. Asked why he put this question, the man replied to this curate that surely he could not be without that book " since you have been educated at Oxford and trained in all the superstition and idolatry of the Church of England." Obtaining one copy of the idolatrous book from him, they seized Mr. Bell, with great show of arms, and in the presence of the full armed company, placed him on the uppermost step of the market cross. After the inevitable discourse in the best Covenanting tradition, the Prayer Book was thrown into a fire kindled for the purpose, and when half-burnt, rescued on the point of a pike and held aloft amidst the cries of: " Down with prelacy, idolatry, and superstition of the churches of England and Scotland! "

When Mr. Bell was questioned as to his adherence to these communions, he boldly declared he would maintain it in face of the world; refused to abandon his ministry of the priesthood, and asserted that though they should tear his body as they had torn his gown, they would never force his conscience. For,

following the invariable custom of the rabblers, these had torn his black gown [1] and stamped it underfoot, as "the garment of the whore of Babylon". The chief rabbler dared him again to exercise his ministry at his peril, to which Mr. Bell replied he *would* do it at his peril. Finally, he prayed God to forgive them and not to lay these things to their charge. Then he was dismissed and told that he was "an ignorant, obdurate curate, and malignant".

By a Proclamation of February 6th, 1689, this "rabbling" was forbidden, and amongst others, the Rev. James Little, curate of Tinwald and Trailsflat in Nithsdale, attempted to regain his parish. Six Covenanters there warned him against making the attempt and on his referring them to the Proclamation, they scoffed at it, and said the obligations of the Covenant were the only authority for them. Mr. Little courageously took service on two successive Sundays at Tinwald, and on the third Sunday went to Trailsflat. There he was immediately set upon by a band of some fifty Covenanted ladies.

First of all they beat him about severely with clubs, and tore successively into shreds his gown, coat, vest and shirt.[2] They were proceeding to strip off his breeches when he prevailed on them, for the sake of decency, to leave these upon him. When he reminded them that William of Orange had commanded all violences to cease till after the Convention of Estates had met, their reply was they could not obey man's laws, but only those of their King in Heaven to whom their present doings must be acceptable. These ladies

[1] See p 285 [2] See for contrast p 264.

kept Mr. Little naked for two hours, exposed to severe cold, and continued their behaviour by pinching and slapping him all the time. Then they took him to the church door, and ordered him to confess all his wickedness—his ministering under a popish and tyrannical king, and informing against singular saints such as themselves. Mr. Little's reply was: "God Almighty forgive you and me all our wickedness, and if you will have the patience, I shall preach a sermon to you wherein I will show you upon what ground you and I may build the forgiveness of all our wickednesses, because everyone that asks forgiveness does not obtain it." The ladies answered by pelting this "soul-murderer" with mud, when, after going off with the church keys, they left him in his naked state to get home as best he could.

The conclusion of the whole matter, as of this chapter, is obviously that the Solemn League and Covenant was for its subscribers the ultimate law from which there could be no departure and no appeal. Hence "Jacob Curate" in his *Short Catechism* previously quoted has this:

Question: "Why do the Presbyterians give the title of saints to the rebels that died at Pentland Hills and Bothwell Brig, and yet will not give the title of saints to any of the Apostles?"

Answer: "Because the Apostles never subscribed to the Solemn League and Covenant, and never rose in arms against the King."

Chapter VI

THE CASE OF CLAVERHOUSE

Tradition versus History

I

"Where there is smoke there must be fire" is not as true now as it used to be when fire alone caused smoke. But even when fire alone did, the trite old adage, used so often to justify some malicious statement, did not in fact do so. Before the saying could be so employed, it would be necessary to ascertain from what sort of fire the smoke emanated. Was it a legitimate fire—in home, factory, or camp; or was it the work of incendiaries intent on deliberate mischief? Popular Covenanting literature is so largely compiled from tradition that one must be as cautious in accepting it as good evidence as one is in accepting that of smoke.

"Tradition may be a lying jade, but not always", is the plea of the latest Covenanting story-teller for his liberal reliance on tradition. When a defamatory tradition, however, emanates from a country where the Covenanting rebellion was quelled, and the queller was, in consequence, hated, that tradition has little claim on critical credence, especially when it is at variance with the facts of history. But since where the dead are concerned, there is no law to deter Covenanting copyists from libel, they are perfectly safe in making new gramophone records for each genera-

tion, of the old slanderous aspersions on Claverhouse, and thereby merit accrues to them from their uncritical readers—if nothing more substantial from the publisher.

There are in existence seven authentic portraits of Claverhouse, and in all are to be seen the same characteristic features and dark flowing locks of his natural hair. As both the Melville and the Glamis portraits are familiar from frequent reproduction, the mezzotint by R. Williams in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, has been chosen here as much less known.

The portrait, we are told, " is that of a sensualist of the school of Charles II, and just the man who would evince the fierceness and the cruelty tradition assigns to him when purity and holiness, in the person of a Covenanter, fell into his hands ". " If Torwood is right in declaring that Claverhouse bore 'the strong expression given by our painters to Judas Iscariot ', it is not to be wondered at that the Covenanters saw Apollyon himself in this Apollo Belvedere of the Royalists."

Readers must judge for themselves the type of character shown in the features and expression of the face.

The first appearance of Claverhouse in the Covenanting country was, when in September, 1678, at the age of thirty, he was given the difficult and dangerous task of suppressing conventicles in Dumfriesshire and Annandale. It must be borne in mind that there was no police force in these days nor till long after, and that therefore there was only a military agency for the Government to employ to enforce that law and



JOHN GRAHAM OF CLAVERHOUSE, VISCOUNT DUNDEE

From the mezzotint in the Bodleian Library, Oxford

order which was chiefly threatened by the conventicles.

What were these? The Covenanting ministers asserted that government by them was by divine right, and that the people must therefore obey them, otherwise the pains of everlasting damnation would be their sure heritage. So the State, not wishing to intensify rebellion, left people to the free exercise of their conscience in the *family circle*, but forbade more than five strangers, as likely to be fomenters of rebellion, to meet at a house conventicle.

So to elude penalties for breaking this injunction, many of the preachers gathered together their followers in the fields, and the people, first arming themselves on the pretext of defending their defenceless ministers, soon formed themselves into an army. Indulgences were from time to time offered to these ministers that they might be "settled" in churches. Only a few availed themselves of this leniency, to be execrated and reviled for this unforgiveable sin by their outraged brethren. These still insisted on their own terms, and would tolerate nothing short of them —quite in the best style of de Valera. Hence they and their followers became a menace to the common weal, and their armed conventicles, or meetings, the excuse for unlawful gatherings. In fact the Act of Parliament, 1 James VII, c.8, rightly terms them "the Nurseries and Rendezvouzes of Rebellion".

It was just a year before Archbishop Sharp's murder by the Covenanters that Claverhouse went to Dumfries, and on April 21, 1679, he had to report on Welsh, the minister ejected from Irongray for his tur-

bulence. He wrote on April 24 from Dumfries: " I find Mr. Welsh is accustoming both ends of the country to face the King's forces, and certainly intends to break out in an open rebellion. I expect him here next ". There is evidence of the Committee of Council at Lanark that the King's soldiers were being robbed and beaten, and in some cases wounded and killed by the Covenanters. These people, then, were clearly no harmless enthusiasts, only seeking liberty of conscience, but armed fanatics of the most violent and dangerous type.

II

Much has been said as to the severities of the Restoration having goaded the Covenanters beyond endurance, but those who thus excuse them conveniently ignore the conduct initiated by the Covenanters themselves when they were in power. The cruelties of the Covenanters might well have justified an uprising. Their victims, however, simply endured the tyranny until it was overpast; and this silent endurance has been so greatly respected by Covenanting writers that they, too, have kept silence about it.

What was the policy which Claverhouse consistently pursued in dealing with the rebellious Covenanters? Writing to Queensberry he says: " The way that I see taken in other places is to put laws severely against great and small in execution, which is very just; but what effects does that produce but more to exasperate and alienate the hearts of the whole body of the people? For it renders three desperate where it

gains one, and your Lordship knows that in the greatest crimes it is thought advisable to pardon the multitude and punish the ringleaders where the number of them is great, as in this case of whole countries [districts] ". Again he writes: " For what remains of the laws against the fanatics, I will threaten much, but forbear severe execution for a while, for fear people shall grow desperate, and increase too much the number of our enemies ". Finally on the subject of his policy, Claverhouse writes again to Queensberry: " It will be of more consequence to punish one considerable Laird than a hundred little bodies, because it is juster, for these only sin by the example of those ". As an instance of this on another occasion Claverhouse writes: " Did the King [Charles] and the Duke [of York, James] know what those rebellious villains, which they call ministers, put in the heads of the people, they would think it necessary to keep them out [of their parishes]. The poor people about Minnigaff confess upon oath that they were made to renew the Covenant: believe the King was a Papist, and that he designed to force it on them ".

On February 20, 1934, when the fifty victims of the Austrian Socialist rising were buried in Vienna, Dr. Dollfuss announced that martial law throughout the whole of Austria would be raised at 7 a.m. next day. The President Miklas, addressing the vast throng said concerning the rebels: " The heaviest punishment will be meted out to the leaders, and will be coupled with leniency towards the misguided and betrayed rank and file ".

It was surely the "Persecutor" come to life again, announcing once more his sane and effective policy.

When the following of historical facts is of no moment, imagination has endless scope in vilifying a man. It makes a far better story, with a pathetic "thrill", to represent Clavers and his men as exulting in hunting down the godly, blameless peasants and their gentle ministers—as man-eating tigers trail their innocent victims, the taste of whose blood only induces a lust for more. The unlimited licence to do as they liked then appears as that "liberty of conscience" for which the Covenanters sought—for themselves only. This is why *they* could consistently denounce tolerance as "carnality", because it only had reference to toleration for others to differ from themselves.

Claverhouse's character—according to the Covenanters and their supporters—is chiefly summarized in the epithets bestowed upon him by them. Here are a few out of many more as agreeable—"persecutor", "bloodthirsty wretch", "insatiable demon", "hell-wicked-witted bloodthirsty Clavers", "ever accursed damnable Bluidy Clavers".

What justification is there for this wealth of picturesque description of, evidently, the world's worst villain? He was utterly without mercy, we are told, he has "no records of humane deeds" to his credit. Let us test this statement by history.

Early in 1679 Claverhouse sent from Dumfries a series of ten letters to Lord Linlithgow, then Commander-in-Chief in Scotland. In January he wrote:

"I was going to have sent in the other prisoners, but amongst them there is one Mr. Francis Irwin, an old and infirm man who is extremely troubled with the gravel, so that I will be forced to delay for five or six days." A fortnight later, on February 8, he wrote: "I hope your Lordship will pardon me that I have not sent in the prisoners that I have here. There is one of them that has been so tortured with gravel, it was impossible to transport him, besides, expecting considerable orders, I have no mind to part with thirty or forty horses, and then Sunday's journey has a little jaded our horses." Another instance of Claverhouse's care for his horses (as well as his men) is evidenced in a postscript to a letter he wrote in April: "My Lord, I know not how to do for hay". Money for the provision of troopers and horses alike was urgent, and at last, after much insistent persistence, an Order in Council came securing to Claverhouse "three pecks of corn and eight stone hay or straw for each troop horse weekly", whilst other cavalry, evidently lacking such championship, had to be content with only two and seven respectively.

It is a saying, generally accepted, that a merciful man is merciful to his beast, but Claverhouse's care for horses is, by Covenanters, turned to his own undoing for, they say, it is quite evident that he ranked them above human beings. The one indisputable fact about Claverhouse is that he was, literally, the devil incarnate, and Covenanters, so well up in all the works of the devil, are surely competent to interpret any virtue alleged in favour of Claverhouse, and, with this knowledge, they discount it. They do so in

this further instance of another incident which would be, otherwise, considered creditable to any man.

It was in September 1688, when Claverhouse was newly married and in love, that he left his young bride for Edinburgh, feeling that it was his duty to obtain further powers from the Privy Council of which he was then a member. Was this to strengthen his hands against the Covenanters? It was not. He had been newly appointed Constable of Dundee, and he sought and secured authority to remit the death sentence passed on some thieves he found imprisoned in the Tolbooth, and to substitute whipping or banishment, according to the nature of each prisoner's crime. But the one Covenanting writer who mentions this "unique instance of pity" explains it on alleged utilitarian grounds with great but not convincing ingenuity. "Hangings were expensive, and not so profitable as the disponing [disposing] of criminals to be home slaves".

The upright conduct and generosity of Claverhouse appear in the following instances.

In 1682 Sir James and Sir John Dalrymple, father and son—the latter the successful organiser of the Massacre of Glencoe—offered Claverhouse a bribe of £150 to secure his silence regarding the many political irregularities of their distinguished family. Claverhouse scorned the bribe.

Again, there was a shortage of soldiery to deal with all the disorders over such a wide-spread countryside as Galloway. In order to lessen the expense of raising 100 dragoons there more adequately to keep the peace, Claverhouse wrote to Queensberry on

March 1, 1682: " I will take superintendence of them without any pay ", and in July, 1689, he wrote to Cluny Macpherson, the most influential chief of the central Highlands: " Those who bring in the provisions shall be fully satisfied for them ", omitting, however, to say that he himself would be the paymaster.

In keeping with these assertions of Claverhouse are the testimonies of two witnesses. The fourth Earl of Balcarres, like Claverhouse himself, a gentleman of great integrity and honour, states in his " Memoirs " that " Claverhouse though not profuse in personal expenditure, was lavish in spending his money which the King's service required ". Drummond of Balhaldie, in his *Memoirs of Lochiel* alludes to Claverhouse's exact " economy in private life ", and adds: " In the King's service he was liberal and generous to every person but himself, and freely bestowed his own money in buying provisions to his army ".

Again, there is a Latin transcript by one who, there is every reason to believe, knew Claverhouse ever since his boyhood at St. Andrew's. The translation of part of this—which really constitutes an epitaph—runs as follows: " More ardent for the welfare of his country than for his own happiness, more enamoured of duty than of profit and ease, he was animated by so burning a zeal that—disregarding danger, despising risks, neglecting his loved ones, and scorning malice—he, with great daring, endeavoured to restore downtrodden things, and to redeem his country ".

Claverhouse himself wrote in 1683 to Lord Queensberry: "However things go, I am resolved to do as a good subject ought and a man of honour. I will by no means prejudice the King's service for my interest, nor will I do mean things to insinuate myself". His whole career shows that this was no vain boast, for over and over again he showed in practical fashion how great was his concern, not only for the troops under his care, but that through their neglect by the Government, the King's service should not be brought into disrepute. "Claverhouse," said the Duke of York, later James VII, "is not the man to say things that are not."

There was no little wisdom in the way Claverhouse put into practice his own principles, as related in his letters. The way he went to work in Galloway exemplifes this.

Within the writer's memory, Presbyterians in consonance with their formularies, have used their places of worship for all kinds of secular usages, from a Sunday school "soiree", or an entertainment, to a political meeting. Even yet this custom survives in some places. So that Claverhouse's action was no outrage on the Covenanter's religion when he writes as follows to Queensberry in 1682: "I have called two or three parishes together at one church, and after intimating to them the power I have, I read them a libel [1] containing all the Acts of Parliament against the fanatics . . . and in the end

[1] Scots law term for the English "charge" or "count" against the accused Here the meaning is reading a gist of the Acts of Parliament

told them that the King had no design to ruin any of his subjects that he could reclaim, nor I to enrich myself by their crimes,[1] and therefore any who would resolve to conform and live regularly might expect favour; excepting only resetters[2] and ringleaders ". The following Sunday Claverhouse reports " there was about three hundred people at Kirkcudbright Church, some that for seven years before had never been there ". He had at first to complain, however, that no sooner had he and his men gone " then in comes their ministers, and all repent and fall back to their own ways, so that it is vain to think of any settlement here without a constant force . . . and that is the opinion of all the honest men here, and their desire ". This was the occasion on which Claverhouse suggesting raising one hundred more dragoons for the garrisoning the country offered to superintend them " without any pay ".[3]

Claverhouse assured the people " that whatever their guilt was, if they gave obedience they need fear no great severity ", and after this, he writes to Queensberry from Kilmarnock: " There will be need to make examples of the stubborn that will not comply. Nor will there be any danger in this after we have gained the great body of the people, to whom I am become acceptable enough, and having passed all bygones upon bonds of regular carriage hereafter ". So successful was Claverhouse's policing of his Sheriff-

[1] Another instance illustrating the " mercenary ", " miserable clamourer for spoil " and inability ever to rise " above considerations of pelf " with which pro-Covenanters charge him

[2] Those who hid the guilty [3] See p. 209.

dom that he could report to the Committee: "It may now be safely said that Galloway is not only as peaceable but as regular as any part of the country on this side of Tay; and the rebels are reduced without blood, and the country brought to obedience and conformity. The authority of the Church is restored and the indulgenced ministers can live in safety".

Owing to his common sense and non-provocative conduct of affairs, Claverhouse was completely successful not only in reducing the Covenanters to order by his bloodless measures, but in becoming "acceptable enough" to them.

Unlike Montrose, Claverhouse was only a subordinate—"the merciless executor of the orders of his superiors"—and like those of another equally subordinate company he certainly believed:—

"His not to reason why,
His but to do or die".

So, on January 6, 1679, he wrote from Dumfries to Queensberry: "My Lord, since I have seen the Act of Council the scruple I had about undertaking anything beyond the bounds of these two shires is indeed frivolous, but was not so before: for, if there had been no such Act, it had not been safe for me to have done anything but what my order warranted; and, since I knew it not, it was to me the same thing as if it had not been. And for my ignorance of it, I must acknowledge that till now, in any service I have been in, I never inquired further in the laws than the orders of my superior officers".

Covenanting writers invariably find this letter too long to quote in full, but they always feel a part of it

should be given. Curiously enough, they all fasten on the last clause as a fair sample of the whole letter, which clearly indicates that Claverhouse cared not one jot for any laws except the orders of his military authorities.

Claverhouse's strong sense of justice is another marked characteristic. Early in 1679 when he was returned to Dumfries he heard that a poor man's horse had been killed by a shot from the castle where some of the Dragoons were quartered. He reported that "I went immediately and examined the Guard, who denied point blank that there had been any shot from thence". Not convinced by this he "heard the Bailie take depositions of men that were looking on who declared upon oath that they saw the shot from the Guardhall" and saw the horse fall. Claverhouse, anticipating the modern detective, then instructed that a search should be made in the horse's head for the bullet, and when it was found it was discovered to be similar to those used by the soldiers. On this he wrote to Lord Linlithgow: "It is an ugly business, and it is extremely against military discipline to fire out of a Guard. I have appointed the poor man to be here to-morrow, and bring with him some neighbours to declare the worth of the horse; and have assured him to satisfy him, if the Captain, who is to be here, refuse to do it".

In 1682, again, Claverhouse ordered a notice to be given in all the Galloway parish churches that if anyone had any complaints to make against his soldiers, they should go to Strathaven "where they would find persons ready to give them immediate satisfaction".

Then there is this third case. Despite repeated entreaties, no money had been sent him for the support of his mounted troops. So on February 8, 1679, he wrote to Lord Linlithgow: " I am forced to let the Dragoons quarter at large in the country. I have visited their quarters and found it impossible they can subsist any longer without a locality. What prejudice the King's service may receive by this I know not, but I am sure it is extremely improper to be thus quartered. . . . For my own part, if my troop come to want hay and straw, I will go to any of the commissioners' lands that are adjacent and take it, offering the rates, and I think I do nothing but what I may answer for, though I be very unwilling to disoblige any gentleman ". A postscript to yet another letter on the same subject in April, says: " My Lord, I know not how to do for hay, now when we lay so strong. We have not got any locality, nor are we like to get money. For my part, I'll never solicit it more; and if the King's service suffer, let the blame lie where it should ".

At this period, the colonel of a regiment was entirely responsible for providing the " liveries " of his soldiers, although the Government was supposed to refund the expense. In actual fact, it made such trifling payments, that many colonels, themselves none too well paid, resorted to various means to recoup themselves. The worst was when they docked the luckless private soldier of a large portion of his insignificant pay.

Now it happened that at the Privy Council of December 11, 1684, a bill of complaint by some private

soldiers against their colonel, was read. The colonel happened to be James Douglas, brother of the High Treasurer, Lord Queensberry. The soldiers stated that Colonel Douglas had dismissed them arbitrarily and " taken the arrears of their pay and clothed and shod some of the rest of the soldiers therewith ". Claverhouse, supporting the complaint, said it would " discourage any to enter His Majesty's service if they were used thus ". Queensberry greatly resented this as reflecting on his brother, nor was Claverhouse's popularity with the rest of the Council thereby enhanced. For his moral courage—rarest of all virtues to find in a man in any age—his upright conduct, single-minded loyalty and steadfastness to principle, and his devout Churchmanship were a silent but standing rebuke to the base qualities of the majority of Scotland's rulers.

III

Covenanting charges against Claverhouse as a cold-blooded murderer bring us into the richest field of fiction in all Scottish history, for in this case, so-called "tradition " is mainly the invention of non-contemporary, Covenanting chroniclers. The greatest of these is Robert Wodrow (1679-1734), a minister, and the expressed aim of his voluminous writings is to " aggravate the fault of [Presbyterianism's] enemies ". All his " authorities " are conveniently anonymous and dateless, but they still continue to be the source from which every writer, who serves up the old story once again, draws his

"facts". Even Dr. Hewison, who ranks far above the ordinary "follow-my-leader" copyist writers on the Covenanters, cannot resist the attractions of Wodrow, on whom, with Defoe, he relies in some cases to support his charge against Claverhouse—that he was a "ruthless reveller in the blood of his countrymen", and that there were "above one hundred men whom he killed in cold-blooded cruelty".

Before investigating these charges, however, it may be useful once more to press upon readers' attention the type of person with whom the Government and Claverhouse, as one of its agents, had to deal. In 1666 at the skirmish at Rullion Green "armed pastors"—true to the Covenanting tradition—"joined in the fray". During the fight, a certain Rev. Mr. Robertson thus thought it becoming to address Almighty God: "And if Thou wilt not be our Secondarie, we will not fight for Thee at all; for it is not in our cause, but Thine own, and if Thou wilt not fight for it, neither will we". This being the Covenanting attitude towards the God they professed to serve, their implacable defiance towards a Government against which they rebelled may be imagined.

In a letter to Queensberry, dated June 9, 1683, Claverhouse wrote: "I am as sorry to see a man die, even a Whig, as any of themselves. But when one dies justly for his own faults, and may save a hundred to fall in the like, I have no scruple". It was on this principle, to which he had given previous expression in other words—"to pardon the multitude and punish the ringleaders where the number of the guilty is great"—that Claverhouse consistently acted.

Whether this " tradition " of Wodrow's, which has been faithfully followed by nearly every one of the Covenanting storytellers seems in accord either with this principle, or with Claverhouse's character generally, each reader must judge for himself. Here is the legend as retold by the latest writer in the Covenanting succession: "(Claverhouse) called himself a cleanser, and the Covenanter's religion ' the plague of Presbytery '. But this was his method of cleansing. He would call together country boys and girls, some of them no more than six years old. The bairns were told to go down on their knees before the dragoons. There were times when he even ordered the soldiers to fire over the children's heads to terrify them the more. Then after this hell-invented fun, he would tell them that their lives would be spared if only they revealed the whereabouts of their fathers and mothers ".

From this " tradition" of Claverhouse in the part of a contemptible coward and bully—conduct evidently constantly repeated throughout the Covenanting country—we turn to the " murders " charged against this " ruthless reveller in the blood of his countrymen "—to the cases of " above 100 men whom he killed in cold-blooded cruelty ". This number is obtained from Defoe, author of the immortal *Robinson Crusoe*, and an English Dissenter, who after little more than a year in Scotland, published in 1717, a book in support of those akin to him in religion, and entitled *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*. This shares fully in the attributes which are the common property of all these

non-contemporary defenders of the Covenanters, entirely unsubstantiated and often wildly reckless statements. In his *History*, Defoe says: " Claverhouse murdered above 100 of the persecuted people, several with his own hand ".

However, after going through the innumerable non-contemporary pro-Covenanting " authorities ", mostly contradictory and sometimes destructive of each other; and the tombstones (also non-contemporary) with their inscriptions, many of which significantly begin " Here lyes ", " the above a hundred men " in actual fact amount to no more than thirty-three alleged victims, mostly named, and when these charges are rigorously investigated, there is no possibility of associating Claverhouse personally with more than four of them, involving five lives. This total, however, is only reached by refusing Claverhouse the benefit of the doubt where, in one case, doubt exists.

All over the small area of south-west Scotland which produced the inestimable blessings flowing from Covenanted warriors, there are some eighty tombstones, in their form scrupulously expressing the simple beauty of Calvinism, and in their epitaphs giving utterance to sentiments completely in accord. Few, if any, of these stones were originally erected earlier than 1701, at earliest: that is, eleven years after Presbyterianism became by Act of Parliament the " Church of Scotland as by law established ". For it was in October 1701, at Crawfordjohn, Lanarkshire, that at a general meeting of the " Societies "[1]

[1] See p 190

it was resolved " provide and make ready stones as signs of honour to be set upon the graves of our late martyrs as soon as possible ".

Before going into any of the cases of the innocents whom Claverhouse was alleged brutally to have murdered, by tombstone epitaphs, and other equally reliable authorities, it is desirable to have an authoritative definition of what does *not* constitute murder.

In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* the subject is dealt with under the heading of *Homicide*, from which the following is an extract: " Homicide is justifiable and not criminal when the killing is done in the execution of the law. The most important case of justifiable homicide is the execution of a criminal in due course of public justice ".[1] This condition is most stringently interpreted. " To kill the greatest of malefactors uncompelled, and extrajudicially is murder. . . . And further, if judgment of death be given by a judge not authorized by lawful commission, and execution is done accordingly, the judge is guilty of murder. (Stevens' Commentaries, Book VI, Chapter VI.) The execution must be carried out by the proper officer, or his deputy: any person executing the sentence without such authority, were it the judge himself, would be guilty of murder. . . . Homicide committed by an officer of justice in the course of carrying out his duty, as such, is also justifiable; for example where a felon resists a legal arrest and is killed in the effort to arrest him ".

[1] The dictionary defines a criminal as one who violates the law, or who commits an act punishable by law.

Does war constitute murder?[1] Not according to Chapter XXIII of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, owned by the Covenanters as equally by Presbyterianism to-day. Other extracts from that chapter also deal with the reciprocal duties "of the Civil Magistrates", which have also a direct bearing upon Claverhouse's actions in the course of his duty. Section I states: "God . . . hath ordained civil magistrates to be under Him over the people . . . and to this end hath armed them with the power of the sword . . . for the punishment of evil doers". Section II says: "It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate, when called thereunto: in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice and peace . . . so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions". Section VI declares: "It is the duty of people to . . . honour their (the magistrates') persons, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority for conscience sake. Infidelity or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him—from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted".

Let Claverhouse in the execution of his office, then, be judged by these Presbyterian principles, without

[1] Yet on the gravestone at Airdsmoss, Ayrshire, commemorating, amongst others "That famous and faithful preacher of the Gospell, Mr. Richard Cameron, who . . fell here in an encounter with the bloody enemies of truth and godliness," in the accompanying doggerel he is referred to as "murdered." No mention of those "murdered" *by* him, however, is made.

any casuistical gloss, and let their application to his case determine the extent of his guilt.

IV

On the farm of Priesthill, in the parish of Muirkirk, Ayrshire, is a flat stone bearing the inscription: "Here lies the body of John Brown Martyr who was murdered in this place by Graham of Claverhouse for his testimony to the Covenanted work of Reformation Because he durst not own the authority of the Tyrant, destroying the Same, who died the first day of May A.D. 1685 and of his age 58".

It was under the Act of Parliament following the Abjuration Oath that Claverhouse took action. This Act decreed that any persons who owned or refused to disown, Renwick's "treasonable Declaration, on oath, whether they have arms or not, be immediately put to death; this being always done in the presence of two witnesses and the person or persons having commission to that effect".

This is the report that Claverhouse wrote on May 3, 1685, from Galston, Ayrshire, not far from Drumclog, to the Lord Treasurer Queensberry. Besides giving an account of his execution of John Brown, Claverhouse continues with the case of that rebel's nephew. This, the greater part of the despatch, will be given later.

"May it please your Grace—On Friday last, amongst the hills betwixt Douglas and the Ploughlands, we pursued two fellows a great way through the mosses, and in the end seized them. They had

no arms about them, and denied they had any. But being asked if they would take the *abjuration*, the eldest of the two, called John Brown, refused it, nor would he swear not to rise in arms against the King, but said *he knew no King*. Upon which, and there being found bullets and matches in his house, and treasonable papers, I caused shoot him dead; which he suffered very unconcernedly ".

This is the only contemporary account of the execution of John Brown, who, according to Macaulay, was " versed in divine things, blameless in life, and so peaceable that the tyrants could find no offence in him except that he absented himself from the public worship of Episcopalians ". The minister who wrote the very popular *The Martyr Graves of Scotland* makes this comment on the execution: " The abjuration oath Brown might well refuse, and yet be a very peaceably minded man. Certainly it is an oath that few people, Jacobites not excepted, would like now to swear ". So, in common with every other Covenanting story-teller, this gentleman prefers to leave the terms of the oath [1] to the imagination of his readers, contenting himself, by a subtle indication, to suggest the enormity of its nature.

Another ingenious Covenanting apologist says of " the treasonable papers " found in Brown's house, " I have a strong suspicion they were something like the " Westminster Confession ", or " Rutherford's Letters ", or " Guthrie's Causes of God's Wrath ".

[1] See p 194

A more ingenious writer, however, is scarcely in accord with Lord Macaulay, for he writes: "Let it be confessed that the Priesthill carrier was in revolt against the rulers of the land". But he pleads:— "Are there not moments when rebellion is transfigured into spiritual duty and when the subject clothes himself with honour if he takes rank amongst insurgents?" So have religious fanatics pleaded to excuse their irreligious actions since fanaticism came into being.

Now let the graphic pages of Macaulay provide a vivid drama. Following eighteenth-century traditions—the contradictions of which will be indicated later—the great writer states that the devout Covenanter's wife and child were present, and that even the brutal troopers mutinied when required to shoot the innocent John Brown. "The prisoner, meanwhile, raised above himself by the near prospect of eternity, prayed loud and fervently as one inspired, till Claverhouse, in a fury, shot him dead. It was reported by credible witnesses that the widow cried out in her agony: 'Well, sir, well; the day of reckoning will come,' and the murderer replied, 'To man I can answer for what I have done; and as for God, I will take Him into my own hand.' Yet it was rumoured that even on his seared conscience and adamantine heart the dying ejaculations of his victim made an impression which was never effaced."

What authority is there for these embellishments of Claverhouse's own account? Five years later there was published the first of four short entries

all worded precisely the same, and probably copied from one another, stating that Mrs. Brown was present when her husband was shot. She herself may have supplied this information, and because Claverhouse had not occasion to mention her presence, the omission in no wise negatives the statement that she was there. It is, therefore, possibly true.

But what of other particulars? Macaulay had the choice of two very late "authorities"—Wodrow and Walker—and of these he chose Wodrow to supply him with his "credible witnesses"—all unspecified, and therefore unverifiable. If Macaulay's story from Wodrow be true, we have several things to reconcile.

(1) How came the "martinet" and candid correspondent to fail to report such mutinous conduct on the part of his troopers in his letter concerning the execution of John Brown? If *he* was not the man to pass over such a mutiny, were his troopers any the more likely to refuse to obey the order of a commander so constant in his regard for their welfare: sometimes paying for their food and their horses' fodder out of his own pocket, and fearlessly championing the unpopular cause of the common soldier on the Privy Council? (2) Was one, who, in the words of a Presbyterian writer, "discouraged license and profanity amongst his men," likely to follow, even afar off, the blasphemous lead of so many Covenanted preachers?

Before leaving Macaulay's elegant polishing of Wodrow's clumsy narrative, it is interesting to notice

that the Whig historian amended it to the extent of attributing the melting of the soldiers' hearts, not to Brown's gift of prayer, but to his wife's condition, of which, however, Walker has nothing to say. Walker's variations of Wodrow's story are that Claverhouse bade Brown pray before his death, but thrice interrupted him. "At one of these interruptions he was pleading that the Lord would spare a remnant, and not to make a full end in the day of his anger, when Claverhouse said: 'Sir, you know neither the nature of preaching nor praying, that call this preaching.'[1] When he ceased praying, Claverhouse said to him, 'Take good-night of your wife and children,' for she stood by with a child of his former wife clinging to her."

Walker also relates gruesome details of the widow's procedure after her husband's death, and gives, as a quotation from John Brown's epitaph,[2] this couplet:

"Butchered by Claverhouse and his bloody band
Raging most rav'nously o'er all the land"

The once very popular *Pictorial History of Scotland* (in which the "history" is entirely swallowed up in the pictorialness of its narrative) pieces together both the tales of Wodrow and Walker, and further embellishes them with fresh details of its own invention.

[1] A critic reading this chapter in manuscript, thought this might be true in view of the fact that, quite recently, someone having had painful experience of Protestant extempore prayers, said they were like "leading articles addressed to the Almighty".

[2] See p. 221

We have precisely the same variations in the journalism of the day after any sensational crime has been committed. *The Times* may be trusted to give a sober account of the plain facts without any superfluous garnishings. But such does not please the popular palate. This demands " thrills ", and so we have the *Dashing Daily* and the *Weekly War-whoop* to cater for a large public. In these papers we shall get the richly decorated " story ", aburst with sensational details, alive with " human interest ", and not lacking some " sob stuff " to bring in the pathetic " touch ". The two accounts may, in many places, be contradictory, but no matter. It is " what the people want ", so they get it, and like to think it is the truth. It is precisely the same regarding the " Killing Time " and the Covenanters generally. On this, a modern Presbyterian observes: " That the Covenanters were in the main incontestably right . . . no doubt is the popular view in Scotland, but that a view is popular is no guarantee of its being correct."

V

The case of John Brown's nephew, with a name of many variations, provides an excellent instance of Claverhouse in the part of a " ruthless reveller in the blood of his countrymen ". Claverhouse concludes his report of May 3rd, on the execution of John Brown, already quoted, thus: " The other, a young fellow and his nephew called John Brownen, offered to take the oath, but would not swear that he

had not been at Newmilns in arms, at rescuing of the prisoners. So I do not know what to do with him. I was convinced that he was guilty, but saw not how to proceed against him. Wherefore, after he had said his prayers, and carbines presented to shoot him, I offered to him that, if he would make an ingenuous confession, and make a discovery that might be of any importance for the King's service, I should delay putting him to death, and plead for him. Upon which he confessed that he was at the attack of Newmilns, and that he had come straight to the house of his uncle's on Sunday morning. In the time he was making his confession, the soldiers found out a house on the hill, underground, that could hold a dozen of men, and there were swords and pistols in it; and this fellow declared that they belonged to his uncle, and that he had lurked in that place ever since Bothwell, where he was in arms. He confessed that he had a halbert. . . . He gave also an account of a conventicle, kept by Renwick at the back of Carntable, where there were thirteen score of men in arms, mustered and exercised, of which number he was with his halbert. . . . I doubt not, if we had time to stay, good use might be made of his confession. I have acquitted myself when I have told your Grace the case. He has been but a month or two with his halbert, and if your Grace thinks he deserves no mercy, justice will pass on him; for I, having no commission of justiciary myself, have delivered him up to the Lieutenant-General to be disposed of as he pleases. I am, my Lord, your Grace's most humble servant, J. Grahame."

One of the comments of a Covenanting author on this is: "As to the few swords and pistols found [underground] Claverhouse must have been more craven-hearted than even Covenanters have depicted him, if the sight of them in a hole, in a lonely moor, filled him with fear"!

As Brownen or Browning's name does not occur in any "martyrs'" list, this negative evidence may be accepted as positive proof that he was pardoned when General Drummond received him from Claverhouse with his recommendation to mercy.

Almost on all fours with Browning's case is that of the "martyr", Andrew Hislop, who appears to have been handed over to the judge, Johnston of Westerhall, by Claverhouse with the same plea. It seems, however, that Westerhall had no more power than Claverhouse to reprieve formally, so that, apparently, Hislop met the fate of other rebels under the Abjuration Act. On his monument at Craighaugh, Dumfriesshire, which was erected in 1702, the inscription begins: "Here Lyes Andrew Hislop Martyr shot dead upon this place by Sir Jas. Johnston of Westerhall and John Graham of Claverhouse for adhering to the Word of God, Christ's kingly government in his house, and the covenanted work of reformation against tyranny, perjury, and prelacy, etc., etc."

Wodrow and his fellow-collectors of Covenanting gossip think it quite sufficient to make incomplete statements regarding Claverhouse's various villanies. For instance, he is present when the writer is not sure in what parish the alleged shooting took

place: sometimes Claverhouse shoots a man when such evidence as there is, makes his presence at the scene of murder on the date alleged most unlikely.

It is exactly the same with regard to the statements on the tombstones of monuments to the Covenanted martyrs, who include men who died of wounds gained in battle and those killed in conflict. Claverhouse must indeed have been ubiquitous personally to have shot or wounded every one of them.

Of a man who was fatally wounded at the battle of Drumclog and was buried at Loudoun, in Ayrshire, his epitaph records: "Here lies Thomas Flemming of Loudoun Hill, Who for His Appearing in ARMS In his Own Defence and in Defence of the Gospel. According to the Obligations of Our National Covenants And Agreeable to the WORD OF GOD Was shot in a Rencounter at Drumclog June 1st. 1679 by bloody GRAHAM of Claverhouse."

Half-a-mile distant is the parish of Galston, in the churchyard of which is a monument thus inscribed: "Here lies Andrew Richmond, who was killed by bloody Graham of Claver-House June 1679. For his Adherence to the Word of God and Scotland's Covenanted Work of Reformation. When bloody Tyrants here did rage Over the Lord's own Heritage To persecute His noble Cause By Mischief Framed into Laws Cause I the Gospel did defend by Martyrdom my life did end."

Nothing whatever is locally known of the man

commemorated beyond the assertions of the epitaph, nor does his name appear in any list of " martyrs ". Claverhouse wrote from Galston on May 3rd, 1685, but he does not appear to have been there in June. Neither on this monument nor on the last mentioned is there any date of its erection.

The value of the sources from which Covenanting story-tellers obtain their stale material in comparison with the omitted facts of history bearing on Claverhouse, remains to be estimated. Much of Covenanting " tradition " has been already mentioned, and only two other instances, of a different nature, need be given to complete the case for Claverhouse. The first is in connection with some sessions of the Privy Council in 1682–83. Sir John Dalrymple had brought many accusations against Claverhouse with regard to the state of Galloway, where he lived. He maintained that the people were " orderly and regular ". Claverhouse retorted that there were as many " elephants and crocodiles in Galloway as loyal and orderly persons ". He succeeded in proving every one of his contentions, greatly disconcerting Dalrymple, who had left no stone unturned in an attempt to overthrow Claverhouse, but could not succeed in substantiating a single charge against him.

It was precisely of this time when Dalrymple was accusing Claverhouse of having lapsed into unjustifiable leniency that Wodrow, writing in the next century, was assuring his readers that he had " many particular accounts " of the " Persecutor's " enormities. He further states, " We shall

find Claverhouse raging in the west and south and committing many grievous oppressions." In a line with this is Wodrow's further statement regarding the time immediately following the finding of the Privy Council that Dalrymple was guilty. Once more the Persecutor appears "exerting his power to the utmost" in the south and west of Scotland, and creating "an inexpressible terror and confusion". In actual fact Claverhouse was just then in England —with Charles II at Newmarket.

Claverhouse, again, with characteristic independence, opposed the proposal that the Government should use a contingent from the Highlands to terrorize the Covenanters. He suggested, rather, a new disposition of the regular troops to dispense with imported clansmen.

Claverhouse, a staunch and devout Episcopalian, had created a great sensation in going the next year to a rabidly Covenanting house for his bride, Lady Jean Cochrane. Her mother was apparently very rigid, but her influence was obviously of no avail in face of Claverhouse's infectious fervour. His tenacity of principles would never have allowed him to mate with one opposed to him in religion, and in his character, as "a cleanser", as he wrote to the Duke of York, he obviously converted Lady Jean before she became his betrothed. This is the plain inference from his letter of vindication to the Duke. He wrote: "I may cure people guilty of that plague of Presbytery, but cannot be infected. . . . As for the young lady herself, I shall answer for her. Had she been right-minded," he continues ironically,

"she would never in despite of her mother and relatives (have) made choice of a persecutor, as they call me."

Not popular on the Privy Council because of his single-hearted devotion to his loyalties, his marrying into Lord Dundonald's fanatical family was made the excuse for removing Claverhouse from the Privy Council, but it only proved to be a three months' exclusion. For on May 11th, 1685, King James, well knowing Claverhouse's invincible loyalty, restored him. It was during just those three months of suspension and supersedure that the most severe cases of executions under the Abjuration Act took place.

It is a candid Presbyterian who writes: "The persecution was in fact political far more than religious: Claverhouse and his dragoons were simply in their own view and in that of their superiors, engaged in enforcing obedience to the King and Constitution."

VI

By soldiers, who have studied the great exponents of their profession, Dundee, as a military genius, is held to be second only to Montrose, who was—in military matters—Dundee's model. Dundee is generally considered to have shown bold initiative, originality, and adaptability, and to have been a masterly strategist with a sound knowledge of warfare and keen military insight, and to have possessed one of the great qualities conspicuous in the out-

standing generals of every age. This is the power to kindle and sustain enthusiasm and to win even personal devotion, which he gained by selflessness and care for others.

Of Dundee just before Killiecrankie, Balhaldie wrote: "He had gained so much upon the affections of his small army, that, though half-starved, they marched forward as cheerfully as if they had not felt the least effects of want." And again: "He knew so well to adapt himself to the humours and inclinations of the people whom he commanded, that there was a general harmony and agreement among all the officers of his little army, and so great was the confidence they reposed in his conduct, that they resigned themselves entirely to his pleasure without searching into his designs. Though the Highlanders are in general a high-spirited and proud people, and of unruly and stubborn temper, yet the authority he had over them was surprising."

To this a Whig, Dalrymple of Cranstoun, adds: "If anything good was brought to him to eat, he sent it to a faint or sick soldier. If a soldier was weary, he offered to carry his arms. He kept those who were with him from sinking under their fatigue, not so much by exhortation as by preventing them from attending to their sufferings. For this reason he walked on foot with the men, now by the side of one clan, and anon by the side of another. He amused them with jokes; he flattered them with his knowledge of their genealogies, he animated them by a recital of the deeds of their ancestors and of the verses of their bards. It was one of his maxims

that no general should fight with an irregular army unless he was acquainted with every man he commanded." So great was his influence over the clansmen, which he attributed to asking nothing from his men that he would not do himself, and the affection he inspired, that he attained the supreme seal of Highland adoption—a Gaelic naming, *Iain dubh nan cath*—"Dark John of the Battles". This honour not even Montrose had achieved, though, like his kinsman, he had completely identified himself with his men.

These estimates of Dundee as a soldier are justified by his conduct at Killiecrankie, where he was faced by more than twice the number of his own men, and showed himself as fearless as a worthy leader should be. Early on the day of battle Lochiel, in council, thus addressed Dundee: "My Lord, I have just now declared in presence of this honourable company that I was resolved to give an implicit obedience to all your Lordship's commands, but I humbly beg leave in the name of these gentlemen to give the word of command for this one time. It is the voice of your Council, and their orders are that you do not engage personally. . . . On your Lordship depends the fate, not only of this brave little army, but also of our King and Country. . . ."

The whole Council seconded Lochiel's appeal, then Dundee craved leave to reply. "Gentlemen," he said, "as I am absolutely convinced and have had repeated proofs of your zeal for the King's Service, and of your affection to me as his general and your friend, so I am fully sensible that my

engaging personally this day may be of some loss if I shall chance to be killed [1]; but I beg leave of you to allow me to give one *shear darg* [a harvest day's work] to the King, my Master, that I may have an opportunity of convincing the brave clans that I can hazard my life in that service as freely as the meanest of them. Ye know their temper, gentlemen, and if they do not think I have personal courage they will not esteem me hereafter, nor obey my commands with cheerfulness."

When in 1690, Parliament was proceeding to attaint and confiscate the title and estates of Dundee, sworn evidence by a Whig was given to this effect regarding his death. One, Johnston, had caught Dundee as he fell from his horse. The Viscount then asked: How the day went? And was answered, "The day went well for the King," meaning King James, but that he was sorry for his Lordship. To which Dundee replied it was less the matter for him, seeing the day went well for his master.

Thus died Dundee, a devout and devoted Episcopalian, of clean life, "hating both wine and women", as even his enemies testified, and faithfully fulfilling his duty to his King as well as to God. For a contemporary biographer writes of him thus: "Besides family worship, performed in his household regularly morning and evening, he entered

[1] That great "Saint of the Covenant", Argyll, taking a similar view, took a different course on the ground that *his* life was too precious to risk So when he heard Montrose was at the gates of Inveraray, he forsook his clansmen, not for the only time, and prudently fled down Loch Fyne in a boat, leaving his clansmen chiefless to face the foe.

into his closet at certain hours and employed himself in private prayer. This I affirm on the testimony of those who lived in his neighbourhood, in Edinburgh, where his duties as Privy Councillor often obliged him to be; and particularly from a Presbyterian lady who lived long in the same house where he resided, and who was otherwise so rigid in her opinions that she could not believe a good thing of any person of his persuasion till his conduct obliged her to rectify her mistake. He kept up the same pious custom in the army." Amongst all the charges brought against Claverhouse, hypocrisy finds no place.

And the latest author to write of him, Miss Cunningham, in her *Loyal Clans*, says: "Dundee's character and his career fell short of the romantic idealism of Montrose, just as the circumstances of his time lacked the heroic quality of the earlier period; but he surpassed him in the consistency of his public conduct, or rather, perhaps, in his practical, political ability. His unshaken loyalty, the brilliance of his short campaign and the completeness of his single victory restored for a moment . . . the early glories of the Cavaliers. . . . No element of selfishness or worldly wisdom disfigured his policy or weakened his resolution. Few of either party could be truly called 'a good Christian, an indulgent husband, ane accomplished gentleman, ane honest statesman, and a brave souldier.' (Sir Ewen Cameron in his *Memoirs*.) And as Dundee rose superior in his private life to the degrading vices of his contemporaries, so his gallant spirit excelled

them in devoted loyalty to the ancient monarchy of Scotland."

Finally, the coarse language and expressions of hate common to Covenanting writers, find no place in Dundee's letters, the strongest expression he allows himself in his exasperation being his reference to "that plague of presbytery". Hence all that his calumniators can fasten on is the bad spelling, in which he was not singular in that or any age, and which is scarcely a crime.

Never more than to-day is there need to follow the example of John Ruskin, who wrote in 1853 to the author of *Our Village*: "I went and knelt beside the stone which marks the spot of Claverhouse's death-wound, and prayed for more such spirits—we need them now."

"Last of Scots and last of freemen—
Last of all that dauntless race,
Who would rather die unsullied
Than outlive the land's disgrace!
O thou lion-hearted warrior!
Reck not of the after time.
Honour may be deemed dishonour,
Loyalty be called a crime.
Sleep in peace with kindred ashes
Of the noble and the true,
Hands that never failed their country,
Hearts that never baseness knew
Sleep! and till the latest trumpet
Wakes the dead from earth and sea,
Scotland shall not boast a braver
Chieftain than our own Dundee!"

Chapter VII

SOMETHING ABOUT THE INCLINATIONS OF THE PEOPLE AND THE PERSECUTION OF THE EPISCOPALIANS

I

The Papal Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, issued by Leo XIII in 1896, speaks of the papal claims as "the venerable and constant belief of every age". The appeal to history, however, shows how false is the claim of papal supremacy to this antiquity. Only to take two instances, the notorious pseudo-Isodorian Decretals, better known as the "Forged Decretals";[1] and the forged testimonies purporting to be from the Greek Fathers, were deliberately prepared to support papal pretensions.[2] On both forgeries, a vast edifice was erected—the doctrine of papal supremacy as it exists to-day. Just as this doctrine was thus *not* "the venerable and constant belief of every age", but is based on perversions of the truth, so, too, was the claim of Presbyterianism to represent "the inclinations of the generality of the people" at the Revolution. Yet on this false claim Presbyterianism obtained and maintained its supremacy in Scotland.

[1] Long since admitted by Roman writers to be spurious.

[2] These were used by Pope Urban IV in the thirteenth century in an attempt to obtain the submission of the Eastern Church to the Papacy.

When William of Orange landed in England, he was under the impression, made upon him in Holland by the Presbyterian preacher, William Carstares, that Episcopacy had little hold in the Northern Kingdom. Thus his intention was to abolish it in that country; but finding out that he had been entirely misled, the Dutch Prince considered it politic to gain the adherence of the Scottish bishops.

Thus Compton, Bishop of London, was authorized by William to approach Bishop Rose of Edinburgh. Compton said: "If you will undertake to serve him (William) to the purpose that he is served here in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church and order, and throw off the Presbyterians."

This was a bid for the political support of the then strongest ecclesiastical party in Scotland, and when next day the Dutch Prince and Bishop Rose met in Whitehall, the former asked: "My Lord, are you going to Scotland?" "Yes, Sir," replied Rose, "if you have any commands for me." William answered: "I hope you will be kind to me and follow the example of England." Rose, like the other Scottish bishops, was a staunch Jacobite, and thus awkwardly posed, he made the most "mannerly and discreet answer" he could "without entangling" himself. "Sir, I will serve you as far as law, reason, and conscience will allow me." At this reply, William turned on his heel.

Once again, however, the Scottish bishops had a chance of accommodating themselves to the govern-

ment when the Convention of 1689 met in Edinburgh. Its president, the Duke of Hamilton, assured the Primate and Bishop Rose that William had pledged his word that nothing should be done to the prejudice of Scottish Episcopacy, if only the bishops would follow the example of the majority of their English brethren and support him. Mistakenly or otherwise, the Scottish bishops, like the stalwart seven of England, felt they could not violate their oaths of allegiance to King James and his successors. Thus, because they set fidelity above state patronage, which would have at least secured the old Church against the persecution which was to follow, Episcopacy was finally disestablished in Scotland.

Disestablishment, though it was to be welcomed as purging the old Church of every taint of Erastianism, was, on the part of the Government, a purely political move. For it was not the General Assembly, but the unconstitutional Convention-Parliament in Edinburgh, that embodied its resolutions in the Claim of Right. This, with a lofty disregard for truth, declared " that Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters is, and hath been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation (they having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters) and therefore ought to be abolished ".

Faced with the prospect of enjoying a political ascendancy once more, Presbyterianism at once saw

the mistake of all those vaunted anti-Erastian principles for which, even in the immediate past, blood had been spilt as water. One thing alone mattered, "the triumph of Presbyterianism". Overboard went the plea of establishing Presbyterianism because it was agreeable to the Word of God—much less because it was of divine right. Now it must be dethroned because it was alleged to be in accord with "the inclinations of the generality of the people"—what a contemporary Covenanting writer calls "a very loose, unsure foundation". Hence, *vox populi vox Dei* became in actual fact the basis of Presbyterianism's claim of right. Yet in face of this claim there was a strange fact that the Presbyterians now would have none of their chief court, the General Assembly, for the calling of which Episcopalians, in July 1689, vainly appealed. The truth was that, knowing they would have been outnumbered and outvoted by six to one, Presbyterians took such alarm at the request that with all their force they successfully opposed it.

It was the Act of Parliament of June 7th, 1690, which conferred the title, "Church of Scotland", on the triumphant Presbyterians, and this Holland-sent reward for political support became, and remains, Presbyterianism's crown. Indeed, "the Pattern of the new Tabernacle was made in the Parliament House"; and "no establishment could have been more Erastian in origin"—than the present "Church of Scotland as by law established".

Not only was the new Presbyterian Establishment

Erastian in origin, but until the creation of the *Reichskirk* by Hitler, surely no ministry known to history was ever as Erastian as it. The records of the Presbytery of Deer in Aberdeenshire refer to " planting of Kirks " by " the new ministers of the Government ", or, alternatively, " ministers of the Established Government "; and even down to comparatively modern times there are references to " Parliamentary Churches ", that were State-built.

To what extent the " inclinations of the people " were ignored and overridden does not, of course, emerge in any popular history of Scotland. Even the non-popular histories, almost without exception, content themselves by giving the oft-quoted general statement of Carlyle, the Presbyterian minister of Inveresk, that " more than two-thirds of the people of this country, and most of the gentry, were Episcopals " in 1689 and later. In 1690, General Mackay, a staunch Presbyterian, wrote: " Let men flatter themselves as they will: I tell you who know Scotland, and where the strength and weakness of it doth lie, that if I were as much an enemy to that interest (Presbyterianism) as I am a friend, I would without difficulty engage to form in Scotland a more formidable party against it *even for their Majesties' government*, than can be formed for it." This declaration is supported by the disparity in numbers evident between the bishops with their following of some six hundred clergy, and the hundred and eighty or so ministers and lay elders, none from north of the Tay, who formed the first Presbyterian post-Revolution General Assembly.

II

Now that Presbytery had finally triumphed, it proceeded without loss of time to scatter its blessings broadcast with no niggard hand. The Assembly of 1638 had foreshadowed something of sabbatarianism " with a new degree of intensity ", and one of the sins specifically charged against the bishops was " breaking the Sabbath Day ". Thenceforward " the Sabbath idea grew more and more strict, as is evident from the new impetus which the Judaic institution had received by 1690. From that time Sabbath-breaking came to be considered as one of the two great sins to be wrestled with and its suppression engrossed the kirk sessions' time and care."

The Kirk Session consisted of the minister and his elders who " scoured the streets, peeped through windows, and smuggled or forced themselves into houses and chambers to see how the holy day was kept, offenders being promptly delated to the session. The pulpits resounded with denunciations and warning against this sin. . . . To take a stroll, or to allow children (to do so); to be in the house during sermon; to serve ale or to drink it with incomers; to play at the pennystone; to drive a cow along the road. . . . To shave others or be shaved, to look out of the window; to engage in worldly conversation, were all sins against the Sabbath, for which convictions and punishment are recorded in the minutes of the Kirk Sessions. In 1785 a man was delated to the Kirk Session of Lumphanan for going to see his

mother on the Sabbath, and carrying a stone of meal to her as a present, and refusing to acknowledge he was at fault, he was excommunicated."

To this day the same Judaism is found in many parts of the Highlands. Presbyterians who entirely ignore Christ's dying command: " This do in remembrance of Me ", observe the fourth Commandment with the strictness of the straitest sect of the Pharisees. People will neither draw water nor take in peats " on Sabbath ", and this, as in most cases, is not confined to the smaller and stricter Presbyterian sects. Where one of these prevail, however, as in the neighbourhood of Gairloch, Ross-shire, visitors are refused lodgings unless they promise they will neither write letters nor go out walking " on Sabbath ".

Regarding those excommunicated for " Sabbath-breaking " and other sins, " the only method as a rule by which censure could be removed was by public appearance as a penitent. The penitent, in sackcloth, sat on the stool or a pew reserved for the purpose, and after sermon, was exhorted by the minister. It was seldom that the ordeal was passed in one day; three, four, up to nine days the penitent might be required to appear. In more serious cases, the delinquent might be required, after a number of days of humiliation in his or her own church, to go the round of the neighbouring parishes as well. The power of sessions to enforce discipline is attested by the fact that, so late as 1786, Robert Burns, free-lance as he was and indisposed to brook authority, did penance in Mauchline

Church, although as a special indulgence he was allowed to receive the rebuke in his own pew instead of on the ' stool '."

We will conclude this subject with a final quotation: " That the proceedings (of Kirk Sessions) became both inquisitional and tyrannical is abundantly proved by session records themselves. According to Buckle, " When the Scottish Kirk was at the height of its power, we may search history for any institution which can compete with it except the Spanish Inquisition," and he cites ample proof for his statement."

It was in 1674 that Charles II had abrogated in England the statute *De Hæretico Comburendo* (of the burning of heretics), and excluded the death penalty as a punishment for atheism or blasphemy. But were Presbyterians to follow an English lead? Perish the thought! The Assembly of 1695 passed an Act against Blasphemy, etc., and owing to the preponderating influence of its ministers in Edinburgh, Thomas Aikenhead, a medical student of 18, was hanged for atheism. " Though he had recanted, and the Inquisition would not have taken his life," says Andrew Lang, " The ministers, out of pious zeal," says Fountainhall, " insisted on his execution ". Thus continued the true Covenanting spirit.

III

The Assembly of October 16th, 1690, before mentioned, met in Edinburgh and appointed two Commissioners, one for the south and one for the

north of the Tay, to instruct the respective Presbyteries as to their proceedings against " scandalous and negligent ministers ". This, of course, referred to the Episcopal clergy who still held their parishes, and were " scandalous " because they had been ordained by bishops, and " negligent " as the inevitable consequence.

In the interests of that " liberty of conscience " of which Presbyterianism was the quite unique champion, another Parliamentary Act of 1690 required all principals, professors, etc., of the Universities, to take the oaths of allegiance, subscribe the Westminster Confession, and to submit to the new Establishment. With the extraordinary exception of those concerned at Aberdeen, excepting James Garden, most of those affected at the other universities refused submission to this Act, and in consequence were ejected from their chairs, to the gain of English Universities.

Presbyterianized history, as we have seen, is full of scorn and contempt for the mean, illiterate, and youthful ' curates '. But one hears nothing from the same source of " the sudden call for young men to fill up vacancies at the Revolution ". Carlyle, minister of Inveresk, says that this need " obliged the Church (Presbyterianism) to take their entrants for the ministry from the lower ranks who had but a mean education ".

Badly wanted indeed were " qualified ministers ", though the " qualification " required was not one of education, but submission to Presbytery and taking the oath to William. In the two Lowland synods dealt with in one volume alone of the *Fasti*, for one

incumbent who in 1689 "conformed to Presbytery", ninety-nine were "outed"—the minority by the rabble—or deserted to English curacies. In the thirty parishes which constituted the presbyteries of Haddington and Dunbar, there were only five Presbyterian ministers, and in those of Duns and Chirnside in Berwickshire, about the same number. So late as 1707, indeed, there were still one hundred and sixty-five Episcopalian incumbents settled in the parish churches of Scotland, despite every attempt to oust them.

That at the Revolution there were actually more Episcopalians who had accepted William than Presbyterians, was, as will have been noted, General Mackay's testimony. Hence, to speak of the whole body of Episcopalians as Jacobites at this period, as Presbyterian writers do, is a designed misrepresentation. For when, in 1695, an Act of Indulgence allowed the deprived Episcopal clergy to take oaths of allegiance and assurance (that is, owning William as king *de jure* as well as *de facto*) without any further exaction, over one hundred [1] so qualified.

That Episcopalians increasingly became Jacobites was largely, if not wholly, due to the persecution to which Presbyterians subjected them under the

[1] Bishop Nicolson, of Carlisle, wrote to Archbishop Wake, of Canterbury, in 1710, after his chaplain's "grand tour" in Scotland:

"There are now 113 Episcopal presbyters in possession of parochial cures, whereof only 11 are non-jurors: whereas of the old Covenanted race of Presbyterians, there are about four times that number, who (though they never pray for the Queen, nor have ever taken the oath of allegiance to her) are overlooked and winked at by the General Assembly."

change of dynasty. They thus looked to the restoration of the old royal line of Scotland for the removal of the proscription of their worship. Refusing, therefore, to pray for William and Mary, many Episcopalian incumbents, though supported by their parishioners, were deprived of their livings.

Even the Covenanters had never been required to register their ordination [1] in a Civil Court as Episcopalians were now required to do, or to pray for Charles or James—much less at every service, as Episcopalians must now pray for the sovereign *de facto*. One, James Semple, incumbent of Fintry, Stirlingshire, spiritedly refused to do this on the ground that Mary was undutiful. "He would not pray for the Queen till she got her father's blessing, and God keep *him* from having such a daughter."

Another cudgel with which Presbyterianism could bludgeon Episcopalian clergy still in possession of parish churches was an act with the pacific title of "An Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church". This required besides the oaths of allegiance and assurance, these incumbents to subscribe the Westminster Confession and accept the Presbyterian government as "the only government of the Church". A further Act in 1695 forbade deprived Episcopalians to celebrate baptism and marriages under pain of imprisonment.

Though Episcopalians, in common, of course, with Roman Catholics, and also with Quakers, suffered in William's reign, the Dutchman, himself a Calvinist, was all in favour of toleration. But intolerance was

[1] Many had none of any sort to register.

merely an alternative spelling of Presbyterianism. The case for the Episcopalian clergy was well put for them by the Marquis of Carmarthen. In a letter dated February 27, 1691, he wrote to William: "I hope you have received true information of these things from Scotland, and if you have, I doubt not but you will give speedy directions to put a stop to the giddy proceedings of the Commissioners of the Assembly against all the Episcopal clergy of Scotland at one blow; who are to be turned out of doors with their families unless they will renounce prelacy to which they are sworn, so that they are not to keep their livings unless they will preserve them by perjury".

In 1691, the Quakers felt impelled to petition the Government in regard to their treatment. As not even a Presbyterian minister could attribute this to their Jacobitism without arousing suspicions of inveracity amongst even the most gullible, the existence of Quakers in Scotland is carefully overlooked by the typical Presbyterian writer. The Quakers owned it was a matter of surprise to them that Presbyterians "who had complained most of persecution, should now be found acting the parts of their own persecutors against the petitioners". Whilst they had suffered much "since the change of government through all parts of the nation by beating, stoning and other abuses, yet in Glasgow their usage had been like French dragoons' usage and furious rabbling than anything that dare own the title of Christianity". They state in their petition that on November 12, "being met together in their hired

house for no other end under heaven than to wait upon and worship their God, a company of Presbyterian elders, attended with the rude rabble of the town, haled them to the baillie, who for no other cause than their said meeting, dragged them to prison, where some of them were kept the space of eight days ".

Persecution, nevertheless, does not appear to have effected any conversions, and the basis of the " Claim of Right " was completely given away ten years after the Revolution by the " Act for Preventing Disorders in the Supplying and Planting of Vacant Churches ". Exactly how " vacant " were the churches to which this Act refers, we shall shortly see.

Repression was the only policy which Presbyterianism was able to pursue with any measure of success, and then not without military [1] assistance. The Dutch king had bestowed the rents of the suppressed bishoprics of Argyll and the Isles " upon erecting English schools for rooting out of the Irish language and other pious uses " in the Highlands. Not unnaturally the Highlanders, amongst whom Episcopalians and Roman Catholics overwhelmingly preponderated, objected to make payments for the express purpose of extirpating their mother tongue and their religion, so that they had to be coerced. The Covenanters, to enforce their will, had first adopted the plan of quartering soldiers upon

[1] As already remarked, in lieu of a police force, it was natural that soldiers should have to carry out police duties. But Presbyterians only demanded their assistance to carry through ordinations, and otherwise to support their actions. See pp. 267, 287, 300, 322, 326.

Episcopalians, but when their example was followed by the Restoration government against them, their indignation was ungovernable. Yet, in defiance again of the golden rule which they never had practised, Presbyterians had resorted to their original plan of quartering parties of soldiers upon the Highland defaulters at their own expense until the payments had been made.

IV

As soon as good Queen Anne ascended the throne the afflicted Episcopalians sought relief. In a " humble address and supplication " to her, they spoke of " the deplorable condition of the once national church since the suppression of its ancient Apostolic government, and the disgrace brought on a Christian land wherein those who had been ordained for the service of Christ at the altar were driven forth as wanderers to beg their bread ". Anne not only answered very sympathetically, but also wrote to the Scots Privy Council in support of Episcopalians, recommending that they should be protected in the peaceable exercise of their religion while they observed the laws.[1]

To such straits had the Scottish Episcopal clergy been reduced that, later, they were driven to seek from England contributions to assist them in their

[1] The General Assembly met their sovereign's letter by a declaration " That to enact a toleration for those that way [and, incidentally, the Queen's way also] (which God of his infinite mercy avert) would be to establish iniquity by law."

urgent necessity as their own people were far too poor to do so. Dr. Scott, Dean of Glasgow, went with credentials from the Scottish to the English bishops to make an appeal " to all good Christians " for help in view of the dire need of the persecuted clergy. This appeal was warmly approved by, amongst others, the Bishop of London.

Now we have to mark Presbyterianism's progress in persistent pursuit of its old fight for " liberty of conscience ". The advance of this inestimable boon was foreshadowed by the Assembly's reply to the Queen in which it informed her, on the old Covenanting lines, that Presbytery was not only " agreeable to the Word of God ", but " the only government of Christ's Church in the Kingdom ". Later, when an Act securing Presbyterian government to Scotland, was included in the Treaty of Union, the Presbyterian tradition required opposition to the similar security proposed for the Church of England. No pledge, it declared, should be given for the maintenance of the prelatic hierarchy in England, for that would involve the entire nation in guilt.

The same kindly concern for the welfare of the sister nation was shown in the House of Commons in 1928, when a majority against the revised English Prayer Book was secured by the votes of Scottish Presbyterians, the opposition having carried the day by the eloquent interference of one of them.

The Act of the General Assembly " against Innovations in the Worship of God " was aimed at the use of the Prayer Book by those who repudiated the claims of Presbytery. Naturally this was the position

of Episcopalians who, at last, were given legal status by the belated Toleration Act of 1712. This not only repealed the Act of 1695, but exempted all non-conformists from the jurisdiction and discipline of the Establishment.

It was not to be expected, however, that Presbyterians would tamely submit to this deadly blow at the Presbyterian Tradition which was their constant care. So a letter issuing from the General Assembly was a petition to the Queen against this bill " to prevent the disturbance of those of the Episcopalian Communion in Scotland in the exercise of their religious worship, and in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England ". The Assembly further delegated three leading ministers to travel to London to oppose the measure. They laboured earnestly amongst Members of Parliament, urging them to reject the measure, with the result that it was carried by overwhelming majorities.

Two years later, however, the Assembly memorialized the Queen on the increase of popery and prelacy in Scotland. Romanists were openly holding their services and making converts, whilst the Episcopalians were just as bold—nay, bolder still. For they, in defiance of Presbytery's absolute veto on any kind of funeral service whatsoever, actually read the Liturgy in churchyards " by the graves of the dead " [1] and in parish churches (where the Episcopalians still prevailed,) as well as in their meeting

[1] The saying of any prayers at a funeral was and is strictly prohibited by the Directory of Public Worship—still one of the " subordinate standards " of the Establishment. See pages 118–19.

houses in places where they had been turned out of the Church.

With the death of the good Queen, came a great revival of Presbyterian hopes for the end of toleration. In 1719 that hope largely materialized in an Act that forbade an Episcopalian to minister in any place where there were more than eight persons in addition to the household, unless the priest had taken the Oath abjuring the Stuart exiles, and prayed for George from Germany. The pretext of this Act was Jacobitism—a political creed, however, which was not without Presbyterian supporters; the real reason for it was an implacable hatred of the Prayer Book by the Presbyterians. The penalty for breaking the Act was six months' imprisonment and the closing of the meeting-house for the same period.

Under stress of this Act, some clergy qualified by taking the Oath and praying for George, and used the Prayer Book in congregations composed largely of English families. Other clergy, however, could not find it in their conscience to comply with the Act, and carrying their people with them resorted to a very ingenious method of evading it lawfully. At first the "qualified" congregations acknowledged the Scottish bishops, but latterly they broke away and sought confirmation from bishops over the Border, hence the schismatic "English Church" congregations in Scotland, of which none now remain. "Unqualified" Episcopalians—Scots to a man—never merited this schismatic stigma despite their enforced use for a time of the English Prayer Book.

If we go to Montrose, we shall find tangible

evidences of the issue of this Act in the two Episcopal Churches—now happily joined. St. Peter's, representing the original "qualified congregation" which afterwards identified itself with the English Church was first built in 1724. It was this church which, in 1773, Dr. Johnson visited, and considered "an elegant building both within and without", remarking that "the organ is adorned with green and gold". He "gave a shilling extraordinary to the clerk", saying, "He belongs to an honest Church." Boswell "put him in mind that Episcopals were but dissenters here; they were only tolerated". "Sir," said he, "we are here as Christians in Turkey."

In the High Street was the building bearing the date 1688, where the non-jurant or "unqualified" Episcopalians used to worship. With lamentable vandalism, this unique historic building was pulled down to make room for the Free Library. Four years later a tablet was affixed within the Library stating: "On this site there stood a building of cruciform plan, which was used as a meeting-house during the eighteenth century by members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland". The upper floor of this old building was divided into four small rooms, one in each arm of the cross, and each containing five persons, who, through the open doors, could join in the worship of the church conducted by the priest where he officiated amidst another portion of the flock in the small room at the centre. The original congregation of St. Mary's, Montrose, represented this faithful flock.

Although there were not anything like the number

of Scottish Episcopalians in the rising of the '45 with Prince Charles Edward as there had been in that of the '15 with his father, James VIII *de jure*, yet the Faithful Remnant was made to suffer more than ever after the second rising. For in 1746 a second far more severe penal statute was passed, not only against " unqualified " ministers but the people who resorted to their ministrations.

Every place in which five or more persons assembled for the worship of the Church was now declared a meeting-house, and for the first offence, the officiating priest received six months' imprisonment, for the second, life banishment to the American plantations —or in other words he was sent into slavery. Laymen who attended these " unqualified " Episcopalian services were liable to a fine and imprisonment if they did not give information within five days. In addition, they were completely disenfranchised, debarred alike from Parliament, or holding any other public office: and even denied admission to the universities.

The further indignity of being obliged to register their Letters of Order before September 1st was put upon the clergy: after that date, none ordained by a Scottish bishop was allowed to " qualify ". Worse, however, was yet to come in the Act of 1748 which was retrospective, and declared null and void the registration of Scottish Orders. Henceforward only clergy in English or Irish Orders were capable of " qualifying ", and the penalties of officiating without " qualifying " were the same as in the previous Act.

The Sunday after the news of Culloden reached Edinburgh, the magistrates, in defiance of the Toleration Act, forcibly closed every Episcopalian meeting-house and chapel. Up and down the country went Cumberland's soldiers burning down all the chapels, or, where this was unsafe, compelling the congregations to pay for workmen to demolish them.

Yet the Episcopalian clergy, some two hundred in 1745, unmurmuring, continued their duties in face of every risk. At midnight, when the Book of Common Prayer could be taken from its hiding place, children were baptized and couples married. Services in their own houses were held for small numbers at different homes and on every day of the week. Their equally devoted flocks met the clergy for worship in the woods or in the hollows of the mountains. With four in the " but " and four in the " ben " of some small cottage, the priest officiated in the tiny passage between. It was no uncommon thing for more people to stand outside the door and windows, indifferent to rain or snow. Frequently farmers would lend their barns for services, and continued to do so despite repeated fines.

Sometimes, in spite of all precautions taken, clergy were caught and suffered accordingly under the penal laws. In the winter of 1748-49, Mr. Greig, priest of Stonehaven, Kincardineshire—to this day a stronghold of the Church—was imprisoned in the local Tolbooth, for pursuing his duties, though " unqualified ". There he was joined by two other priests for the same offence from the same county, Mr. Troup of Muchalls and Mr. Petrie of Drumlithie. To them

came, either early in the morning or late at night, women carrying in their creels, children to be baptized. Wading through a stream and clambering up the rocks, they reached a point below the barred windows of the prison, and there they held up the babes to receive the Sacrament of Regeneration.

In 1755, James Connacher of Gartmore, in Stirlingshire, was arrested there, tried at Inveraray and banished for life for officiating in Argyll, "his activity and diligence being dangerous to our happy Establishment". Walter Stewart, aged seventy, of Ochilbeg in Atholl, Perthshire, was imprisoned six months in Perth for reading prayers to six persons, who were each fined £5 and debarred from all public offices.

These are but a few instances of the many clergy who suffered in all parts of the country accessible to the soldiery who were the chief punitive agents of the Establishment. In the Public Record Office, London, are to be found many letters and other documents illustrating the methods of procedure adopted by the soldiers and other agents of the Hanoverian government after Culloden in doing their best to efface the old Church of Scotland.

Not till 1792 was an Act passed to relieve the Church of the penalties incurred by her faith, but not until the Clerical Disabilities Bill [1] of 1864 came a further Act to remove the insulting stigma on her Orders, for up till then no priest in Scottish Orders might officiate in the Church of England.

[1] Because this Bill placed clergy in Scottish Orders on the same equality as those in England, it was fiercely opposed by leading ministers of the Scottish Establishment, jealous, as to this day, of Anglican innate prestige, and following the lead



Priest Baptizing from the Window of Stonehaven Gaol
1748–9

V

The strongholds of the suffering Church were to be found from one end of the country to the other, and many are worth a visit, despite the fact that no mention of any thing of historic Episcopalian interest will be found in the guide books to such places.

In Glasgow is to be found the oldest church building erected by the Episcopalian Communion since the Reformation. This is St. Andrew's-by-the-Green, situated as its name tells, by Glasgow Green, less than a mile eastward of St. Enoch Station and on the banks of the Clyde. Built in 1750, St. Andrew's was originally a "qualified" chapel, but despite that fact the Presbyterian mason responsible for the offence of its erection, was excommunicated "for the sin and scandal of biggin' [building] it". In the centre of the altar is embodied the last piece of Iona's high altar; and the candlesticks on the altar are made of oak from Bishop Macrae's old bridge at Stockwell, built in the thirteenth century. The organ is that removed from the rood screen of the old Cathedral of St. Mungo in 1812, for it was only after that date that Presbyterians followed the Church in its use of a "kist of whistles". The four bells in use

---

of the mother of Zebedee's children. Chief amongst the objectors was the famous Dr. Robert Lee, because the Bill testified to the practical union between the Church of England and the old Church of Scotland, and as thus conferring a peculiar privilege by Act of Parliament on a rival body.

are those that originally hung in the ancient city steeple.

Kelso, in Roxburghshire, is distinguished in having, " without exception the ugliest of all the parish churches of Scotland, but an excellent model for a circus ". Episcopacy has persisted in the town not only from the days when St. David built the Abbey, but continuously from 1569. No less than three descendants of John Knox, the iconoclast, were at least nominally Episcopalian clergy here. There was his nephew Paul in 1574, and for twenty-eight years his nephew, James Knox, principal of Edinburgh University, whose son, Robert, succeeded him.

The last priest before the Revolution was in 1689 deposed by the Privy Council for refusing to pray for William and Mary. The Episcopalian congregation, however, persisted, and for over seventy years they worshipped in a meeting-house where the priest, to avoid legal penalties, officiated through a hole in the wall to his congregation in another room. Close by the church are the famous ruins of Kelso Abbey, where, in 1716, the Jacobites elected to worship rather than imperil the meeting-house. The first church was erected in 1763 but was superseded by the present one of St. Andrew in 1868.

On the Highland road, of many historical associations, just before Blair Atholl is reached, we pass on the left of the road the Glen Tilt Hotel. Probably not one of all the thousands of motorists and wayfarers who pass by it will observe beyond the cornfields opposite, the tiny little church of Kilmaveonaig beautifully set among the trees. This is one of the very

few old parish churches [1] which is still in the hands of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Its Celtic dedication points to a very early foundation, but the present structure is one of several rebuildings—the chief one having taken place after a partial burning down by Cumberland's soldiers after Culloden.

This very interesting parish church of Kilmaveonaig stood on the property of the Robertsons of Lude, one of the local clans, and it was owing to their faithfulness that it never came into Presbyterian hands. On its walls are commemorated all the members of that family buried there since 1673, and its various records bear witness of the nationality of the old congregation by their names—Cameron, McIntosh, Maclaurin, MacMillan, Forbes, Seaton, Shaw, Menzies, McLean and McIntyre. Naturally, Robertson and Stewart are the preponderating names, since this is their clan country, and the names of McGlashan and Reid, also associated with the Church, were septs of the two clans respectively.

From the little bellcot of Kilmaveonaig still sounds the bell dated 1627, originally placed in the Church of Little Dunkeld. The story goes that it was given by a Mrs. Glas, wife of the then incumbent of Little Dunkeld, and that when her husband forsook the old paths, she declared—prophetically, as it happened—

[1] Of these, the most famous is what is now Roslin private Chapel, near Edinburgh, the choir and Lady Chapel—all that was ever built—of the intended Collegiate Church of St. Matthew, Roslin. Another is the Priory Church of St. Clement, Rodil, Isle of Harris, now, alas, disused, but another, the Priory Church of Queensferry, Linlithgowshire, is in full use.

that the bell should never ring for Presbyterian services, and so it was apparently sold to Kilmaveonaig.

A little more than a mile from this church is that of Old Blair—now an ivy-covered ruin where lie the remains of that pious and devoted churchman, Viscount Dundee. Only a bald inscription on the wall above the bare vault commemorates him.[1]

Leaving Perthshire for Banffshire, let us visit the town of Keith where, on his return as a captive, the Presbyterian Royalist Montrose was preached at by the Presbyterian minister. His text was, of course, from the Old Testament—1 Samuel xv, 33—" And Samuel said, As Thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal ". The preacher, who had once been a chaplain to Leslie, the Covenanting General, was better qualified to hold forth on such a text than Montrose was to receive its application.

But the peculiar interest of Keith for us lies in the fact that it contains three successive Episcopalian places of worship which illustrate the fortunes and evolution of the Church wherever she has survived in Scotland. The congregation in Keith has been continuous since 1688, and the several stages of her growth are to be seen in, first, a simple two-roomed cottage used as a meeting-house : then a small chapel now used as an ironmonger's store, where a woman, still living, was married, and finally, the present fine Church of the Holy Trinity erected in 1882 to succeed the first church built in 1808.

[1] For another commemoration, see p. 323.

Never did a plant of foreign habit find more difficulty in taking root in alien soil than did the exotic of Presbytery in the wholesome ground North of the Tay. Than the old parish of Rathven, comprising amongst other present towns that of Buckie on the coast of Banff, none could better illustrate the firm hold of Episcopacy on the affections of the people: their detestation of Presbyterianism and the means by which the latter ultimately triumphed over their vigorously expressed inclinations. This is the story of a game of see-saw.

John Hay, of the local Rannes family, became priest of Rathven in 1669. It was said of him in 1688 that he had " a good testimonie from his verie adversaries ". But he was first deprived in 1689 for not praying for William and Mary, and five years later was deposed. These sentences, however, had no effect whathever in Rathven for his parishioners were devoted to " Mr. John ".

It was far otherwise with the Presbytery—of Fordyce—which attempted to rule where no one would accept their ruling. Theirs was a bitter complaint—" of supine negligence and utter unwillingness of the parish to call a Presbyterian minister ". Quite as bad was the conduct of the heritors [landowners] of the parish. They presented a man agreeable to themselves, and therefore objectionable to the Presbytery, who refused to institute him, proceeding to nominate in his place one of their own mind. Him the heritors promptly rejected, thereby regaining the right of presentation.

Then the parishioners took their part when the

Presbytery sought further to vindicate its majesty initially by sending an unwanted " pulpit supply ". The first they sent to the church " got neither access nor auditors ": the second fared no better, nor would any man so much as ring a bell for him. The people preferred to attend " the late incumbent's house ", and so the game went on until 1698 when the powerless Presbytery appealed to the civil power " to put the laws in execution against Sabbath-breaking and not attending ordinances "—that is Presbyterian ministrations. This appeal, apparently, was futile, so next year the persevering Presbytery made another move by itself giving a " call " to one Mr. W. Chalmers, " in regard to his great skill and insight in all polemical divinity, especially the papist controversies, his great talent in preaching, and circumspect conversation ".

Despite these impressive recommendations, however, Mr. Chalmers could not get into the Church, so had to be " admitted " out in the Churchyard, the while both male and female parishioners " did scold and rail against the Presbytery and him ". The Presbytery then met at Cullen some distance away to " consider as to Mr. Chalmers having been abused and his person in hazard at Rathven upon Sabbath last by a rabble which had fallen upon him: offered violence to his person; pulling from him his hat, coat and gloves "—but they did not strip him after the indecent fashion of Lowland Covenanters dealing with the "curates ".[1] The parishioners, however, were further guilty of " blackening and scratching "

[1] See pp 103, 199.

his (Chalmers') face, " and stoning him with stones —so that he had not access to the Church ".

Three months later " the Presbytery being informed that Mr. George Hay, keeps a meeting-house in the parish of Rathven, did employ a messenger-at-arms for summoning him before this Presbytery ". Yet despite the embassy of this " messenger-at-arms ", and the impressive qualifications of Mr. Chalmers, four years later a visitation by the Presbytery issued in the report that " none of the heritors compeared [appeared] and but very few of the people. The minister complained that a meeting-house was kept up, to which a great number of people resorted ". A few months after this, the unappreciated Mr. Chalmers departed, nor could the Presbytery find a successor, the heritors and people of Rathven being " peremptorily resolved to adhere to Mr. Hay ".

After a lapse of four years, however, when Mr. John Hay had replaced George as the priest at Rathven, the Presbytery, even if it could not successfully supplant him, felt it at least their duty to reject both him and the schoolmaster, Mr. Smith, who not only refused to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith, but later, as assistant to Mr. Hay, " set up a meeting-house [in Rathven] contrary to law and order ". But despite their appeal to the Justices of the Peace to come to their assistance in getting rid of Mr. Smith, they do not appear to have succeeded any more than with Mr. John Hay.

When he died in 1711, and Mr. Smith had departed, the Presbytery made another attempt to force one

of their ministers on Rathven. But as the heritors and the people alike still remained obdurate, all the Presbytery could do was again to send various of its members as " pulpit supply " to Rathven, but invariably it was to find the church door locked and no congregation.

These attempts, always with the same result, continued for three more years till in 1714 the heritors appeared before the Presbytery politely " craving that the particular circumstances of the parish of Rathven " would be considered, and that Mr. George Hay would be allowed to continue his ministry there, " alledging that none other could be useful there, and that if the Presbytery should proceed to call and ordain any other man among them, the generalitie of the people would apostatise to poperie. The Presbytery refused the petition, Mr. George Hay being of the Episcopal Communion, and having intruded into that Church contrarie to law ".

That by its obtuse conduct, this Presbytery did prove an effective recruiting agency for Rome is witnessed by the fact that, six years later, it took alarm at the " growth of popery " in the parish, and in 1772 the General Assembly actually brought this matter to the King's notice.

A month after the rejected appeal of the Rathven heritors, the Presbytery met at Banff, having found a Mr. Robert Gordon to accept their " call " to Rathven. But the parishioners of Rathven found warm sympathizers in the people of Banff who " impudently threatened the Presbytery " that " if they

would come to Rathven to ordain Mr. Gordon, they might bring his coffin and winding-sheet with them". Pending Mr. Gordon's ordination, further "pulpit supplies" were sent to Rathven, but exasperated beyond endurance, the people assaulted the first comer with stones, till he made off, and the second, warned by his colleague's reception, turned tail.

The heritors were no less determined than the rest of the parishioners, and sent into the Presbytery their objections "stuffed with a great many impertinent queries about reflections upon Presbyterian government". They also alleged that Mr. Gordon had "called them fools and beasts, and advanced that he should be minister of Rathven over their bellies". "After protesting, the gentlemen removed the multitude of parishioners that attended them, venting themselves, after a most insolent and extravagant manner, in threatenings, curses, and horrid imprecations against the Presbytery and Mr. Gordon, after such a tumultuary manner as the Presbytery had ground to fear violence from them, whereupon they were obliged immediately to get out of the church". This, again was at Banff; and the ordination of Mr. Gordon had to take place at a church fifteen miles from Rathven, as the Presbytery, not without good reason, feared violence there.

A few months after this, Mr. Hay, summoned to Aberdeen to answer for his crimes, agreed to leave Rathven, and then Mr. Gordon, appealing to the law, obtained a writ to give him "peaceable possession" of the church of Rathven. This "peaceable possession" was secured by a Deputy-Sheriff,

"accompanied by a considerable company-in-arms", escorting Mr. Gordon. But on their way to Rathven they were met by vast numbers of the parishioners, both men and women, who attempted to stop their progress by throwing stones. Only after strenuously fighting their way through the crowd could the invaders reach the church, the barricaded doors of which they had to break down before Mr. Gordon was able to obtain "peaceable possession" of the pulpit. Whilst Mr. Gordon preached, the parishioners remained outside and gave forcible expression to their feelings. Thus did "the inclinations of the generality of the people" at last prevail in Rathven.

Gordon obtained possession of Rathven Manse in May 1715, but that same summer left the parish and did not return till the following spring. In 1718, he complained that do what he could the people would not attend his ministrations, and in 1720 he died. In 1722 the Presbytery complained they could with difficulty supply Rathven, but next year they "planted" a Mr. Ker, who promptly reported that Mr. Longmuir, a deacon, who did not pray for the King, was ministering in the parish, and that if Mr. Longmuir were not removed, he would break up Mr. Ker's congregation. So again resort was made to the civil power, but despite all Mr. Ker's prodding, and constant action, Mr. Longmuir continued to trouble him.

Evidently having no affairs which might be called their own to occupy them, the Presbytery, prompted by the zealous Mr. Ker, began to mind business that was clearly other people's exclusively; and actually

took exception to those of Mr. Longmuir's congregation to whom a visiting priest had given Holy Communion. It afterwards transpired that the censorious Mr. Ker who had brought a railing accucation against the priest for communicating people whom the minister alleged to be " common and customary swearers and Sabbath-breakers ", was himself guilty of simoniacal conduct, for which he was censured, even by his own Presbytery.

It is scarcely surprising to hear that Mr. Ker met with no more success than his predecessors, but it was not until the Episcopalian meeting-house was burnt down after Culloden and the people were ground down by Presbyterian persecution that at last the cuckoo was left in possession of the robin's nest. The Faithful of Rathven are now represented by the congregation of All Saints, Buckie, which has a day school attached to it to bring up their children in the old paths, and also retains its old church cottage.

Who would suspect Kirriemuir, in Angus, as one of the historic charges of the Scottish Episcopal Church? Is it not renowned as the " Thrums " of Sir J. M. Barrie, and as " Thrums " is it not thought of as the apotheosis of Presbyterianism, where the very air breathes its shibboleth, mostly in the accents of the " Auld Lichts "? Yet it was not till 1716 that after repeated attempts to eject Episcopalians, in the manner of Rathven, that the Presbyterians obtained possession of the parish church. Still the present Scottish Episcopal Church of St. Mary has in use a silver chalice inscribed " For the use of the Church at Killamure " which is dated 1694.

"East is east, and West is west, and never the twain shall meet" declared Kipling, but in Scotland the parish of Glenorchy, centreing in Dalmally in the west, mates with that of Kirriemuir in the east, in its staunch adhesion to Episcopacy at the Revolution.

In 1691 Dugald Lindsay was incumbent of Glenorchy, and the Presbyterians sought to displace him, as an Episcopalian, by one of themselves. This man came to the parish, but not a soul would speak to him except Mr. Lindsay, who received him kindly. On the Sunday, the minister, with the whole parish, assembled in silence, made for the church but as soon as he attempted to enter it, he was surrounded by twelve men with drawn swords. Despite all Mr. Lindsay's entreaties, the minister was marched off to the eastern boundary of the parish, two pipers meanwhile playing the "March of Death". Arrived at the boundary, the intruder was made solemnly to swear he would never enter Glenorchy again, and he kept his word. The Presbytery authorities were furious, but in a country where their number was negligible, they realized their impotence, and Mr. Lindsay was left undisturbed till his death in 1728. And then not till three years later was a Presbyterian minister appointed.

Let a quotation regarding this period from Dr. Warr, minister of St. Giles', Edinburgh, close this chapter. "The General Assembly set itself to . . . face the serious problem of providing a ministry and the ordinances of religion for those parishes which had been rendered vacant through the expulsion of the intransigeant episcopal clergy. Over a distracted

country swept a wave a thankfulness that the fight for religious liberty was ended. The outlook and attitude of the Kirk was statesmanlike and tolerant. . . . Episcopacy had, of sheer necessity, to be firmly suppressed once and for all ".

Chapter VIII

SCOTTISH EPISCOPACY—WHERE IT STILL SURVIVES AND WHERE IT WAS SUPPRESSED

I

Glencoe has suffered two massacres. The first one has passed into history as one of the most treacherous and brutal events recorded in British annals. The second, the new road, unhappily stares one in the face to-day. The scenes of the massacre of 1692—themselves now violated—are reached through the once magnificent pass by this road. Leaving the old road—to gash ruthlessly through uninjured country—the new course, by permanent disfigurement, has degraded the greater part of the glen to the level of a soulless speedway.

The country of Glencoe was, and to a lesser extent still is, the home of Macdonalds and their allied families or septs. After the Reformation Clan Donald throughout the Highlands remained Roman or became Episcopalian, in both cases being loyal to the Stewarts; whilst their hereditary foes, the Campbells, as a clan, became Presbyterian and opponents of the Scottish royal line.

In 1691 William and his government demanded an oath of allegiance from all the clan chiefs by December 31 of that year, on pain of suffering the extreme penalty. But the chiefs had taken an oath

of association to James VII in the name of Almighty God and as they hoped for salvation. It was just as solemn and as binding as the Covenant, but unlike the Covenant, it was forced on no one.

In these circumstances no man of honour could take another oath subversive of it, unless, and until, he was released by James from his old allegiance. The Government, recognizing this, had provided passports for the messengers, though they allowed little enough time for them to go to and return from St. Germains. Such chiefs as had sought and received James's permission to take the oath to William before the final date, did so.

MacIain, the chief of the Macdonalds of Glencoe, was not amongst these. He did not receive his release until December 31, when he at once presented himself at Fort William to take the oath. But it was the wrong place: there was Government red tape even in those days. Not till January 6, 1692, was MacIain able to take the oath at Inveraray, and from here he returned, satisfied by many pledges that, as " a lost sheep " he had been secured in the Government fold. But by the end of the year neither Macdonald of Glengarry nor Macdonald of Clanranald had sworn allegiance to William: probably Sir John MacLean of Duart too, never did so. Why, then, was MacIain of Glencoe singled out for vengeance?

Dalrymple, Master of Stair, himself a Presbyterian, had been the instrument of establishing Presbyterianism, and in 1691 was Secretary of State. In a letter written before the amnesty expired, he, delightedly anticipating a massacre of some Jacobite

clan, wrote of Macdonalds: "That's the only popish clan in the Kingdom, and it will be popular to take severe course with them".

Apart from the fact that there were other clans that were then Roman Catholic, to the Presbyterian of those days, as still to some now, "popish" and "Episcopalian" were one and the same thing. Glengarry, however, was a strong Roman Catholic, but he was much more powerful than MacIain, whom constant Glencoe tradition maintains was an Episcopalian.

In 1713 the whole "catechisable population" is given as 229—"all Protestants"—that vague term which in this case connotes Episcopalian. It is inconceivable that within twenty years of the massacre the population, had they then been Roman Catholics, should have been converted to the old disestablished Church of Scotland just at a time when her priests were sufficiently occupied with their own congregations. There were none to spare for convert-making. Further, it is undisputed that the Stewarts in the adjacent district of Appin were always Episcopalians, and what more likely than that their neighbours were, too? For as loyalty to the Pope endured in certain stretches of the Highlands and did not go in clans, so surely it was, and still is, with Episcopacy.

Amongst the old families of Glencoe it was a firm conviction that it was as much because they were Episcopalians as because they were Jacobites that the Macdonalds of Glencoe were chosen for massacre. Were not those chiefly responsible for this infamy all enemies of Episcopacy, and was it not in keeping

with the relentless persecution to which the old Scottish Church was subjected after the Revolution? Indeed "The plain inference is that the population at the time of the massacre were nominal Episcopalians".

Before the Mother Church of St. John's, Ballachulish, is reached, the beautiful little church of St. Mary, Glencoe, is passed. It is now, unfortunately, the only church in all this Episcopalian country which has still a Gaelic-speaking priest, who can take the services of the Church in the native tongue as well as in English. In the time of the last native priest of St. John's, the writer well remembers the portly Prayer Books, with Gaelic on one side and English on the other, and often attended services at which the prayers and canticles, all so familiar in the English, were said in the Gaelic.

Of one Evensong, taken by the Rev. Donald Mackenzie under the beautiful fir-trees at Invercoe before St. Mary's, Glencoe, was built, Bishop Ewing of Argyll and the Isles [1847-73] wrote: "The keys of the kingdom were delivered in Gaelic, [absolution was pronounced], and the whole service was in the same language. There were about 200 worshippers, and as I looked upon them, every knee bent on the grassy moss, and every head bowed low, repeating the words of our venerable liturgy, I felt myself rebuked by the earnestness of their devotion".

The strength of Episcopacy in this district is further witnessed by the school there which is associated with St. John's Church, and which flourishes exceedingly at Ballachulish. The Prayer Book Cate-

chism is, of course, taught in the school to all who are not withdrawn from religious instruction.

The history of St. John's Church (which has a chapel-of-ease midway between it and St. Mary's,) is full of interest. From the Revolution till 1810, there was no settled incumbent, the congregation being served by itinerant priests who, till long after the '45, had to travel in disguise and to minister secretly in secluded corries amongst the hills. The writer knows of two well-chosen "hollows of the Holy Feast", where in the dark days of the Church, when her worship was proscribed, the Faithful resorted, coming as many as fifteen miles, fasting, to receive the Blessed Sacrament.

The silver altar vessels still in use at St. John's are inscribed "Parish of Appine, 1723",[1] and from them many a clansman who fell at Culloden received his viaticum at the hands of the Rev. John MacLauchlan. This devoted priest is termed by the anonymous author of 1750 as "a non-Jurant of the Highest Kind who was at least half a Papist and a most zealous active cunning fellow with a pretty good share of learning". He is said to have done "more harm amongst the Campbells, McDougals, Stuarts, McLeans and Camerons than any six priests that ever were in Scotland. He often travelled through these and adjacent parts of the country administering the Sacrament of the Supper".

The Journals of the Episcopal visitations of

[1] This was not a case of misappropriation, like that mentioned on p. 331, for the vessels never had any other owners but Episcopalians.

Bishop Robert Forbes of Ross and Caithness, bear striking testimony to the strength of the attachment of the local people to the Church. It was in a " Store House " near the present Church, that, in 1770, the bishop preached to the people who came in such numbers that both the prelate and the itinerant priest were obliged to officiate in the doorway to be heard by the overflowing multitude on the grass. On this occasion the Bishop baptized " between sixty and seventy " and " confirmed one hundred and seventy " persons.

It is interesting to go through the list kept by the bishop of those confirmed in Lochaber and Argyll (i.e. Glencoe and Appin districts). Numbers of the four hundred and forty-six names given are of Camerons or Mackenzies, but the great majority are those either of Clan Donald or Clan Stewart, including, of course, their septs and the families associated with the clan chiefs in various capacities. There are, for example, the MacColls, between two of whom a Stewart of Achnacon is still always borne to his grave, and Carmichaels, hereditary standard-bearers in old days to Stewart of Appin.

Shortly after the bishop's visit, in the time of the Rev. Paul MacColl, the storehouse was converted into a church, and so remained until it was succeeded by the present building, when it became a barn, and may still be seen, near St. John's. Some idea of the number of the Episcopalians may be gathered from the fact that this itinerant priest, " Mr. Paul ", as he was affectionately called, baptized some thousands of persons in his lifetime. But in 1852, four years after

the consecration of the present church, the local community was considerably depleted, for then three hundred people emigrated to Australia.

In the large churchyard that surrounds St. John's, amongst several notable graves is that of " honest Parson Duncan "—Archdeacon Duncan Mackenzie, the last of the itinerant priests. He, like others of his predecessors, was a remarkable man, truly apostolic in the extent and dauntless courage of his labours. At King's College, Aberdeen, where he finished his education, he met Ewen MacLachlan, one of the first Gaelic scholars of his day. To him, young Mackenzie owed his enthusiasm for Celtic literature. He contributed much to MacLachlan's Gaelic dictionary, and himself made beautiful and classic translations of the Prayer Book and other devotional works into Gaelic. Mackenzie also picked up at Aberdeen a little knowledge of medicine as well as some of the simpler forms of law, dealing with wills and contracts. To his poor and scattered flocks in the remote Highlands, where there were neither doctors nor lawyers, this knowledge became of the utmost value.

But of course he was a priest first and foremost, having his headquarters at St. Paul's (Aberarder) in Strathnairn, a Gaelic-speaking district some fifteen miles south-west of Inverness, and passed at Daviot, a parish on the high road to that city. His salary was £40 a year, and in addition to serving his Gaelic congregation in Strathnairn, he had an English-speaking one at Fortrose; another Gaelic-speaking one at Arpafielie: subsequently one at Dingwall,

and, not infrequently, a large Gaelic community at Highfield (Muir of Ord). All these places lie north of Inverness in Easter (East) Ross, and all with the exception of Dingwall, are in the Black Isle.

As regards Dingwall, Episcopalians had formed a continuous congregation there since the Revolution when they had fiercely opposed the intrusion of a Presbyterian minister. But during the years of proscription, in order to escape penalties, they had knelt on the stair of the house where they met for worship rather than forgo it. " Tossed about from room to room and having no abiding place ", " after troublous times ", they, in 1797, strove " to raise a convenient place or chapel " for their services. They were invariably frustrated by the opposition of local Presbyterians, and not till 1852 did they succeed in their efforts.

Meanwhile " Parson Duncan " was continuously travelling throughout his large area, endeavouring to take duty on Sundays and festivals at different centres in rotation. But continuously calls to baptize or to marry, to visit the sick or to take a funeral, interrupted his itinerary, often taking him in the opposite direction to that in which he had planned to go. Daily he had to ride over long distances : latterly his people contributed for a pony and later still, for a horse and gig to enable him to overtake his duties. In this neither snow nor rain, flood nor tempest, stopped him. Without delay he obeyed every summons to a sick bed or to render any service within his power to any member of his attached flocks.

For the poor he had a very tender care. On one

occasion in his younger days, a message came to him that a man and his wife would arrive at the church with their infant to be baptized. That day a heavy snowstorm came on and after waiting in church for some time, the good priest, anxious for the safety of the young couple and their babe, set out on foot to meet them. He crossed the hills, and coming upon them in the open, with snow melted in his hands to provide the water, he baptized the child in the Threefold Name at the place where they met.

Partly accredited to his spiritual endowment "Parson Duncan's" power of healing was such that people came from all parts of the Highlands—from Iona and John o' Groats—to consult him; and in treating erysipelas and simple gastric troubles his prescriptions proved very useful. These, when given to the poorer people, of whatever creed, he would mark with a certain sign, to be dispensed by a chemist in Inverness who was a friend of his. The sign meant that "Parson Duncan" would himself pay for these prescriptions, but this was only one instance of his abounding generosity. For his cheerful and kindly disposition and his sterling character he was highly regarded in all quarters.

Shortly before his death, one Saturday in winter, "Parson Duncan" set out from Daviot in order to take Gaelic services in Inverness the next day. So thickly did the snow lie upon the road that he was obliged to leave his horse at a cottage on the way, trudging for the rest of the journey with the snow up to his knees. Archdeacon Duncan Mackenzie died in 1858, and as a native of Glencoe, in accordance with

Highland custom, he was brought back for burial in the graveyard of his own country.

Presbyterianism, which is still known in this district as the "Parliamentary Church" or *Eaglais nam Mionnan Eithich*— "the church of the false oaths",[1] had no minister in the whole district before 1761, and none settled there till much later. The "Parliamentary Chapel" at Ballachulish—one of 42 erected and endowed by the State—was not built till 1828, when the first Presbyterian minister came to the place.

On the opposite shore of the narrows, in a field near the present Loch Leven Hotel, is Carnglas, supposed to have been once the site of a Columban church, and here the forefathers of present Episcopalians used to assemble secretly to receive the Blessed Sacrament. The priest came to them disguised in a grey suit, and a sentinel was posted on an eminence commanding the Fort William road to give warning if any "red soldiers" were seen approaching. About a mile distant is the beautiful little Church of St. Bride, also of considerable interest; but as that interest is wholly modern, it has no place here.

At the top of the knoll beside Ballachulish Hotel is a strangely ugly monument "erected to the memory of James Stewart of Acharn, or 'of the Glen', executed on this spot, November 8, 1752, for a crime of which he was not guilty". Stevenson in his *Kidnapped* has made familiar—with many fictitious details—the Appin murder. He does not, of course, say that James of the Glen—a man of the highest character—after protesting his innocence, proclaimed

[1] See p. 240.

his faith as an Episcopalian, and so ascended the scaffold repeating aloud Psalm xxxv—"Plead Thou my cause, O Lord, with them that strive against me". This Psalm was afterwards known throughout the Western Highlands as *Salm Sheumais a' Ghlinne*—James of the Glen's psalm.

At Kentallen, where the road winds round the bay to Ardsheal, is a little iron church, served from Duror Church about one-and-a-half miles distant, situated on the roadside opposite Glen Duror from which James Stewart took his name "of the Glen", and whence he was evicted. Up this glen there is a partciular pool in the river Duror associated in the old days with the administration of Holy Baptism when the Sacraments could only be observed by Episcopalians and Romanists in secret.

In the days of persecution elsewhere, as in Strathnairn where "Parson Duncan" served, there are sometimes to be found, often by the roadside, blocks of stone with circular basins in them. These were used by Episcopalians for baptism; and the one in Strathnairn—not far from the Churchyard of Dunlichity and near a natural hollow, hidden from all outside view and used for worship—was so used early in the last century. Often such were called "priests' stones".

The little Church of St. Adamnan at Duror, deserves to be mentioned, because, apart from the more recent chancel, it was built in 1848, by the men of the congregation entirely by their own hands—with the exception of the roof, which they could not manage.

Presbyterianism obtained no entry into Duror of Appin till the last century when a " parliamentary chapel " was built there, and there was here no Presbyterian minister previous to 1828. The next Presbyterian chapel in Appin is about twelve miles further on, and this dates only from 1889, though the first Presbyterian minister here made his appearance in 1828.

The anonymous Whig author of the *Highlands of Scotland in* 1750 writes: " The people of Ardnamurchan and the Stewarts of Appin are the most deeply poisoned with disaffection to a happy constitution in Church and State of any people I ever saw. They idolize the Non-juring clergy, and can scarcely keep their temper when speaking of Presbyterians ". And again: " The people of this country (Apine) are . . . a kind of Protestants, but as has been already observed, idolize the Non-jurant Clergy, and are enthusiastically mad in their zeal for Restoring the Stewart family ".

Portnacrois is the village round the station of Appin, and dated from "Portnacroish in Appin ", October 20, 1782, a letter was sent to Bishop Petrie, signed by " Alex. Stewart of Invernahyle, James Stewart of Fashnacloich and John Macdonald of Glenco ". It made reference to " such a numerous concourse of people who have so long and so strenuously adhered to the Catholic Church ", and urged their claims to a settled Gaelic ministry instead of such infrequent services as they could obtain from the priest itinerating a large district. But it was not till July 2, 1875, that, with every circumstance of

simple dignity, Andrew Macfarlane, Bishop of Ross and Argyll, consecrated the present church of St. Cross at Portnacrois in Appin, of which the Rev. Paul MacColl became the first incumbent. St. Cross, Portnacrois, and St. Mary's, Glencreran, some five miles farther on, are now also served from Duror.

II

As the eighteenth-century writer previously quoted links together the people of Ardnamurchan and Appin, so it seems historically fitting that to-day a few isolated Episcopalians in Ardnamurchan should be ministered to by the priest of Duror of Appin.

Regularly he comes to communicate them as well as on the great Festivals, and his long journey, specially in the winter, may be not without adventure. First, there come five miles overland to Ballachulish Ferry, and after that crossing, another four miles to Corran Ferry, before the run of fifty miles through Ardgour, Sunart, and Ardnamurchan to " the Point "—the most westerly in Great Britain. Not only may the crossing of both ferries be very stormy at any season of the year, and passengers in the boats be soused, but with a road, dangerous at all times, and which in winter may be ice-bound, or occasionally thick with snow in stretches, the journey may be protracted in various ways.

When the road leaves the side of Loch Linnhe and turns inland, the district of Morvern, beloved by Ossian, rises on the left. Despite the liberal character of the celebrated minister of Morvern, Dr. John

MacLeod, there is no word in his *Reminiscences of a Highland Parish* of the hold that Episcopacy had in Morvern, as in Ardnamurchan, long before Presbytery came on the scene, and by the aid of military forces was settled in. Our author of 1750, however, gives the people of both districts the same character, and attributes the constancy of Morvern to Episcopacy to the devotion of Rev. John McLachlan.

But, unhappily, in both, persecution and proscription have wiped out even the memory of Episcopacy in these parts of Argyll. The few newcomers, who have recalled the old Church in Ardnamurchan, are deemed by some—who suppose the name to be a reflection on their popish principles—" black prelatists ". But Scottish Episcopalians received this name from the fact that their priests were distinguished by wearing during worship black gowns, from the Presbyterian ministers who wore dark blue ones. Hence, again, " true blue Presbyterians ".

At Strontian, fifteen miles from the ferry crossing, is the little Church of St. Mary tucked away, with the small graveyard behind it, in the park attached to the " big house ". In 1835 Sir James Riddell, of Ardnamurchan, wrote to Bishop Low requesting that a church might be built for himself and his family, and thirty or forty " pristine-mannered poor Episcopalians " in his neighbourhood. These curiously termed Church people were some immigrant lead workers, and the church was built in 1850 to serve a number of native Episcopalians as well as them.

Unfortunately, here, as in so many more places in the West Highlands where these little churches have

been erected, the native population who worshipped in them have either died out or emigrated, so that the buildings now are closed. Here, however, services are held in August and September, and a few living forty-four miles distant are glad to attend.

Within eight miles from Salen [1], at Glenborrodale, there is a glimpse across Loch Sunart into the mouth of Loch Teacuis in Morvern. Only one-and-a-half miles down is a private chapel at Rahoy, also served on occasions by the rector of Duror, and attended by the neighbouring people—Presbyterian—as well as the family, as the nearest Presbyterian place of worship is fifteen miles distant.

Ardnamurchan is closely associated with St. Columba, for Adamnan, in his *Life*, has references to three incidents, two of which certainly, and the third probably, took place in this " rough and rocky district ". Within four miles of Glenborrodale, on the right hand side of the road, is to be found the spring where St. Columba baptized a child, and but a few minutes farther along, is the beautiful bay of Camus nan Geall, where it is conjectured, that two other tales told by Adamnan of the Saint whilst journeying through Ardnamurchan, took place.

Six miles farther on Kilchoan is reached, and

[1] Just before the descent to Salen, there is a road on the right striking inland by Acharacle into Moidart, Inverness-shire. Acharacle lies at the foot of Loch Shiel, through the middle of which runs the boundary between Argyll and Inverness-shire, also the demarcation between a now Presbyterian country and one—Moidart—where Papalism still holds sway. At the head of Loch Shiel, too, there is a large tract of purely Roman Catholic country, stretching from Glenfinnan to Mallaig.

above the manse is the old graveyard with the ruins of an eighteenth-century building, the " Government Church ", which probably occupies the site of an earlier one.

When in 1697, Alexander Macdonald, a famous Episcopalian incumbent of Ardnamurchan, known as *Maighstir Alasdair*, refused to conform to Presbyterianism, he was deposed by the Presbytery of Lorn for " Nonjurancy ". But though the people were all devoted to him, the farce of " declaring the church vacant ", in accordance with Presbyterian prescription, was gone through, the Presbyterian minister of Ardchattan, one Campbell, volunteering to undertake the performance. He, dressed in the kilt, and armed with sword and pistol, set his back to the wall of the church and defied the people who refused him admittance.

" Master Alexander " was not only a remarkable man of parts, but of immense strength and physical prowess. He lived at Dalilea, on Loch Shiel, and walking over the hills every Sunday, no matter what the weather, he reached Kilchoan before midday, took service there and walked back, arriving before midnight. Altogether he covered about fifty miles on this weekly contravention of a " Sabbath day's journey "—that limitation under the Jewish law still apparently so dear to the heart of the average Highland minister.

Instituted in 1687, *Maighstir Alasdair* died in 1724. In the meantime, however, a Presbyterian minister had been " admitted " to the parish in 1700, and on his death, probably from inanition, a year later, was

followed by a second in 1703, who held on for twenty-nine years. But in 1728 the Synod of Argyll had to record that "the people of Ardnamurchan" are "for the most part of different principles to the Church of Scotland" [as by Act of Parliament created]; and even ten years later the Synod notes that the inhabitants of the same region are "mostly Papists and the rest highfliers disaffected to Church and State". The "rest" so described, were, of course, Episcopalians.

Later, a *Memorial Concerning the Highlands* says of Ardnamurchan: "Many of the inhabitants are Camerons and McLachlans, and violently Episcopal." Possibly this may account for the desertion of the third Presbyterian minister, who, lacking the sticking powers of his predecessor, did not complete three months' stay at Kilchoan. This gentleman, one Daniel MacLauchlan, had been ordained despite charges against him of "drunkenness, swearing, and singing of indecent songs"—probably because candidates for the ministry were scarce. Leaving the parish on the plea of getting a court judgment for his stipend, he went to London "where he filled up the cup of his iniquity by writing and publishing a profane and scandalous pamphlet intituled *An Essay upon Improving and Addition to the Strength of Great Britain and Ireland by Fornication*".

A Hanoverian authority remarks that about the middle of the eighteenth century "the Established clergy through the Highlands and borders of it are, speaking generally, exceedingly negligent in their duty, and persons of no great reputation or esteem".

As regards negligence, certainly the same may be said of them to-day, of whom their own people can say: " He just went into the ministry for a trade."

III

No county in Scotland better exhibits what were the real " inclinations of the generality of the people " at the Revolution than Ross. At that time in the Diocese there were thirty-two parishes, of which one was then vacant. Of the thirty-one incumbents, one voluntarily resigned, declining to accept the new powers: nine were deprived of their livings by the Presbyteries: nineteen, without any submission to Presbyterianism, carried on as usual till their deaths: of one parish the parson's name has not survived: and only one was willing to accept the new Church government, but his services were declined.

In a few parishes, such as Ardersier and Kiltearn, the old Presbyterian ministers were restored, but the only parishes where any number of the people were of Presbyterian views were Alness and Kiltearn. For the rest, so devoted was this whole country to Episcopacy that, despite its privileged position and the physical force at its back, Presbyterianism had to wait some years before making its first attempts to coerce the people. Hence, till 1693, no presbytery could be set up in the county, and until 1706 the Presbyterians had only one, which was gathered together from the whole of the diocese.

Even in 1707, nearly twenty years after the Revolution, the Presbyterian Synod which comprised nearly

the whole of the dioceses of Ross and Caithness, boasted only of ten ministers in contrast to the fifty odd clergy in the same area in 1688. The old incumbents of Lochcarron, Gairloch, Kintail, and Lochbroom were all alive and in possession of their parishes. Probably in no district in Scotland was the Presbyterian settlement delayed so long as here in West Ross, for there were no Presbyterians there at all, the population being divided between Episcopalians and Roman Catholics. Therefore, it is not surprising that the presbytery of Gairloch could not be constituted till 1724.

How Presbyterianism proceeded to "settle" parishes—by causing disturbances in them—is soon told. After a futile attempt to eject the Episcopal incumbent, he was, perforce, allowed to stay on till his death. Then, as no "call" was forthcoming from the people, nothing remained but for the presbytery to give it themselves. This they did, and then took every step to force their nominee on the parish which did not want him. The records provide many instructive and entertaining accounts of these proceedings, of which a few cases, as typical of most, will be given.

Dingwall has been previously mentioned as a stronghold of Episcopacy, and on the death of the priest in 1704, after a notable rout of the presbytery's nominee, a Presbyterian attempt to hold a Synod was thwarted by a parishioner's playing of the bagpipes. When the Presbyterian minister of Tain, unable himself to stop the piping, expressed the hope that there would be no further trouble, the piper's master warmly replied: "If it should be so, you have your-

selves to blame for it." The same answer might aptly have been given in any parish where the presbytery sought to foist a minister upon people who would have nothing to do with Presbyterianism.

The parish of Kılmorack is traversed by all who motor through from Beauly to the surpassing splendours of Glenaffaric. A year after the death of the Episcopal incumbent, the presbytery in 1711 called one, Thomas Chisholm, to minister to a poulation consisting of one thousand Roman Catholics (who still hold this country, and were then served by one of their own priests,) and half that number of Episcopalians. The keys of the church being refused to the presbytery, they proceeded to the manse to ordain their nominee. But all the laying on of hands Mr. Chisholm received at Kilmorack that day was from the indignant parishioners. They, and notably the women, assaulted the doors and windows, and laid about both him and the presbytery with clods, poles, and stones. Small wonder, therefore, that this "settlement" had to be hastily adjourned, and carried out in a parish at a safe distance—Kiltearn, on the Cromarty Firth, some eighteen miles away. Not for two years could Mr. Chisholm obtain access either to Kilmorack church or manse.

In the same year, the same Mr. Chisholm, appointed by the presbytery to have "the inclinations of the people" further carried out in another parish, Gairloch, had an even more adventurous experience, which he duly reported on his return. Near the church in which he was to preach and to announce the presbytery's nomination of one, John

Morrison, as their minister, he was seized by a party of men and carried back six miles. When they released him, he set out for the church again, but by another way, only to be seized a second time by another party of men, who carried him back to Kinlochewe. There, twenty miles distant from Gairloch, he was detained for some time as a prisoner till other parties arrived to carry him successively still further out of the parish, and did " not let go till Sabbath afternoon ". Making the best of a bad job, Mr. Chisholm, not wholly to be diverted from his commission, read the edict appointing Morrison to Gairloch " before six or seven persons in a house " in Kinlochewe whilst he was prisoner there.

As the presbytery were forced to recognize that their nominee could not be admitted at Gairloch, this was done at Kiltearn—their one sure Presbyterian refuge—on the east coast. From here, Morrison, now made minister, took his way to the parish which had clearly shown they did not want him. Exasperated by his intrusion, therefore, the tenants of Sir John MacKenzie of Coul stopped him and his servants at Kinlochewe. They rent Morrison's clothes and shut him and his fellows up for three days in a cottage with cattle, guarded by a relay of tenants. On the fifth day Morrison was carried before Sir John, " who declared that no presbyterian should be settled in any place where his influence extended, unless His Majesty's Force did it by the strong hand ".

Subsequently, a delegation of the presbytery was appointed to converse with Sir John and another

equally antagonistic laird, and to take with them letters from the presbytery, but they got little satisfaction. Fraserdale said he had no interest in the matter and that they had better go to the justices. Sir John, after reading that the letter was " for removing all differences between the presbytery of Dingwall " and himself, first threw the letter away, saying he had no business with the presbytery of Dingwall, and then walked away and left the delegation.

There was, besides Messrs Chisholm and Morrison, another Presbyterian aspirant equally tenacious of purpose, in the person of a Mr. John Grant. He first appears on the scene in 1711 as a probationer to " supply vacancies ", and began his career in that capacity at Avoch, a parish on the Moray Firth, with the usual results. But his report of the refusal of the keys of that church, compelling him to preach elsewhere in the parish, was doubtless made up for by the presbytery's own warm welcome of him—as a badly needed recruit to their insignificant numbers.

Five months later the presbytery met to consider the sad case of Kilmuir Wester, better known as Knockbain, a parish in the Black Isle. This parish had been vacant for " a very long time ", and in view of the necessity for the parish to be " speedily planted ", the presbytery gave a call to the newcomer, Mr. John Grant, to be its minister. Having made various dispositions preparatory to " planting " Mr. Grant on the church of Kilmuir, the experienced Mr. Chisholm, the rejected of Kilmorack, was deputed to carry through the usual procedure at Kilmuir prior to the ordination. He came from his

errand with the usual report—that he had failed to obtain access to the church on the "appointed Sabbath", and had been obliged to preach in a house instead. But as a result of fixing to the church door the edict concerning Mr. Grant, several lairds, "with a great many" parishioners, made their appearance before the presbytery. Asked by the moderator "if they had anything to object why the said Mr. Grant might not be planted minister" of Kilmuir, the Laird of Allangrange as a spokesman, gave a long protestation and many objections, of which the following, with its highly significant and interesting comments, is the summary.

"Mr. Grant nor any other of the Presbyterian persuasion will be acceptable, as they [the parishioners], are all of the Episcopal persuasion." "Being brought up and baptized in the faith of that orthodox persuasion, they cannot comply with any call given to a minister (especially to Mr. Grant) of a contrary persuasion." "Therefore (they) do expect the reverend presbytery would now retract . . . their procedure, in calling the said Mr. Grant to be minister of Kilmuir, seeing it is so farr contrary to their inclination . . . there being none in the whole parish but one, and he not a residenter too, that are for that call." "(2) It is objected that Mr. Grant . . . did not make use of our Lord's Prayer . . . contrary to the practice of Christ's Church in all ages, and of the Reformed Church in all nations, except this." "It is further objected that the inclinations of the people, as well as the popular calls to ministers into particulaire parishes, being the chief reason of the Third Act

of King William's first Parliament, founded upon the claim of right, we think it derogatorie, both to the letter and sense of that Act, and to the fundamentall constitution of Presbyterial Church Government in this nation, that the said Mr. John Grant, or any other of his character, should be imposed . . . on a people or congregation that are no wayes for him, but are declaredly of the Episcopal persuasion, and that of all ranks, sexes, and conditions thereof."

Then followed a protest against the presbytery settling "Mr. John Grant to be minister in our parish, he being of the Presbyterian persuasion, with whose doctrine and method of worship we cannot in our consciences comply, being all of us, except one, of the Episcopal persuasion, and that the imposing of a Presbyterian minister upon us is a grevious encroachment upon our consciences, and against the inclination of us and our people, which by our law is declared the foundation of Church government in Scotland. . . . The ministry of Mr. John Grant, or any other so-called, can be in no way usefull to us, seeing we cannot in conscience comply with his worship and doctrine, or receive the Sacrament from him". The Laird of Allangrange, as the leader of the parishioners, signed all this with five other lairds, elders, and tenants delegate "from the whole parish and all the commons"—to the extent of three pages.

Despite the reasonableness of this protest, the presbytery ignored what they could not repudiate, and persisted in carrying through Grant's ordination. They did so on the ground of ending "the continuing

of the desolations " of Kilmuir, which had been vacant already for " eighteen years to the great loss of that people and ruin of souls especially considering the desolation [that is, the lack of a Presbyterian minister] of the next parish ", Killearnan. They declared themselves encouraged by some anonymous assurance " that a great many in the parish were willing to receive the Gospell if they were not hindered ", and a letter from a heritor of the parish concurring in the call.

Mr. Grant's intrusion took place. But his reception on the Sunday after his ordination, it is not surprising to hear, was such that he refused to return to Kilmuir. According to his account he was first of all surprised by an ambush of some two hundred parishioners, some with blackened faces and women armed with " battens ". His hat was " knocked off and torn in pieces ", and " his head badly cut ". He " was dragged by his cravat till almost choked " whilst the mob still pursued him. His fine clothing was torn to rags, " and after a terrible effusion of his blood and casting cold water upon his wounds ", he was carried to the top of the hill. He alleged that " Mr. John MacKenzie, who preached in the Episcopal meeting for that and the neighbouring parishes " stood looking on, and thereafter preached to the mob, most of them having pieces of Mr. Grant's clothes " tyed or pinned on " to them as trophies of victory.

Exactly the same futile performances were gone through in 1712 by the presbytery at Avoch, also in the Black Isle and north of Kilmuir. A Mr. MacBean had gone to the parish to preach, but as he could

neither get into the Church, nor find anyone to listen to him, he reported " he had not preached to them " ! So then a Mr. Gordon was sent, but despite the same experience, pursued the usual course in order to thrust MacBean upon the parish. It rose in revolt, exactly as in the case of Kilmuir, and headed by several lairds, put in an even more vigorous protest to the presbytery.

The deputation stated that " the haill other parishioners " with themselves disowned and disclaimed " any jurisdiction this presbytery doth pretend " over the parish. They themselves claimed the right of presenting a minister to the parish " by the third Act of William and Mary's first Parliament ". They had unanimously called Mr. Robert Baillie of Inverness after the death of the Very Reverend Roderick M'Kenzie, their late minister. They did " likewise protest and require this presbytery, in the terms of ane Act passed in this present session of the Parliament of Great Britain, entitled ane Act to prevent the disturbing of those of the Episcopal Communion. . . . Scotland in the exercise of their religious worship, and in the use of the Liturgie of the Church of England . . . not only to qualify themselves but the said Mr. Alex MacBean in particular [that is, by submission to the bishop and Episcopal ordination] before his admission to any church, or his exercising any part of his functione ". They further protested that anything they have represented is not to be taken as subjecting them or their parish to the jurisdiction of that or any other presbytery, " seeing we are not of of their communion ".

When, at a subsequent meeting, the heritors declined to depart from their position, the presbytery, after discussing the protests, came to the conclusion that all " was but a meer sham ", and as " there is no access to the church of Avoch ", the ordination was to be made at Rosemarkie. As in the case of his brother intrusionist, Grant, MacBean got no satisfaction from his settlement. He had to report to the presbytery after two years " that, having got no manner of access to the church and parish of Avoch, whereof he is settled minister ", he had raised an action against the heritors. He afterwards went south to prosecute the affair and thus disappears from history.

IV

As was invariably the case in Scotland when Presbyterianism was entrenched by the State in its position, what was law for the Episcopalian goose was not law for the Presbyterian gander. A little more than a century after Allangrange and others had opposed, on the very principles of Presbyterianism itself, the intrusion of ministers upon parishes which would have none of them, there arose the great and lengthy dispute in the Establishment on the rights of patronage.

By vote of the General Assembly of 1834 the Veto Act was passed. Prior to this, the rights of the patron to appoint whom he would—of course a Presbyterian—had not been disputed. Now, however, by mere dissent of a majority of the parishioners, without any

reasons given, a presentee could be rejected. Hence, when in the usual fashion the Earl of Kinnoull presented a Mr. Young—a licentiate of the Establishment—to the parish of Auchterarder in Perthshire, the people opposed his " call ", which only three persons had signed. So the presbytery, as the ordaining body, refused to act; and were upheld by the General Assembly. An appeal from the General Assembly to the Court of Session, however, resulted in a declaration that the presbytery must act. But not till 1839 was Young (who proved a very good minister) ordained to Auchterarder, his settlement there being enforced by the highest legal courts both in Scotland and England and in opposition to the dominant voice of the General Assembly.

For ten years war waged between those who supported the rights of patronage, as upheld by the State, and the " Non-Intrusionists "—a warfare which issued in their emergence as the Free Church body, out of the Establishment in 1843. In the course of the debates of the General Assembly in 1839, Dr. Chalmers, the great champion and leader of the Non-Intrusionists, moved a resolution of which the following is a part: " And whereas the principle of non-intrusion is a coeval with the reformed Kirk of Scotland, and forms an integral part of its constitution, embodied in its standards and declared in various acts of Assembly, the General Assembly resolves that this principle cannot be abandoned and that no presentee shall be forced upon any parish contrary to the will of the congregation." This resolution was carried, and its re-affirmation of

Presbyterian principles, far more outraged by the intrusions in Ross-shire and similar ones elsewhere, in the eighteenth than any in the nineteenth century, still continues to rule the practice of the Establishment.

It was because of the opposition of the Free Church to the Erastian position taken up by the Establishment during this dispute over patronage, that a curious position arose. When Scottish Episcopacy was persecuted out of existence in such large areas of Scotland, it was to the Free Kirk, and not to the Establishment, that Episcopalians turned for the baptism of their children and their marriages.

Presbyterianism apparently began to get desperate when, as time went on, it could still make no impression on the parishes. Outside assistance was clearly necessary to the fulfilment of its benevolent mission. So in 1725, the Presbyterian Synod of Glenelg (in which Wester Ross was now included), approved of a resolution authorizing a deputation to proceed to Inverness and invoke the aid of General Wade, as commander-in-chief of George I's forces in Scotland, and crave "his concurrence and assistance towards redressing the said grievances and strengthening our hands in the Lord's work"—of forcing an alien religion on an unwilling people! Missionaries were sent out by the presbyteries to attempt to "supply" vacant parishes, but they met with "very barbarous and rude treatment", and later in the year, the presbytery speaks of "insuperable difficulties" attending the "planting of their vacancies". The General Assembly ordered five ministers to labour for a short

mission, but only one faced the labour and in three weeks he gave it up.

As late as 1729, Presbyterianism was, on its own admission, still as unsuccessful as ever in obtaining a hold in Wester Ross. In the east of the county, three ministers all reported that, notwithstanding their diligence, " they had no prospect of getting ruling elders "—those essential lay officers of Presbyterianism.

Later, in 1742, at Suddie, there was a very curious incident. It was the custom to give all Presbyterian ministers in addition to their stipends, a separate sum for the Communion elements. This was called " element money " and averaged about £10 for an ordinary parish where the Sacrament would be normally administered once a year for a very small number of communicants. Mr. John Munro, minister at Suddie, had received this money from the heritors, but according to the presbytery, " by reason of certain difficulties and discouragements from the heritors, none of whom are of the Communion of this church, the success of the Gospel had been therein so great measure prevented that the presbytery did never find that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper could have been celebrated in that congregation with any prospect of edification ". It was only to be expected, therefore, that on this admission of there having been no Communion under Presbyterian rule for nearly sixty years in Suddie, that one of the heritors should have called on the minister to repay the element money. Evidently, from the action they took, the presbytery anticipated the repayment would

be enforced, but what actually happened does not seem to have been recorded.

Presbyterianism persistently pursued its aggressive campaign of extermination, and as time went on, it thus succeeded in forcing its ministers into the parish churches. So Episcopalians, driven out of them, began to open meeting-houses for their worship, and with a diminished priesthood, a devoted body of lay readers and catechists came into being. All were duly licensed by the bishop, some to baptize, all to read the prayers of the Church, and to translate into Gaelic a sermon from some accredited church source. Their reverent and devout conduct of the appointed services drew just as large congregations of the faithful as when a priest officiated. Before the great festivals the catechists examined communicants and gave signed lists of these to the priest when he came to celebrate the Holy Sacrament. In such manner in a double sense was the standard of the Church upheld.

After Culloden, revenge was most mercilessly meted out to Jacobites—through their religion. All the Episcopal meeting-houses were either closed or burnt down—mostly burnt down—and the clergy hunted and harassed. These measures, however, in no wise deterred them from their duty, nor the people from attending their services in large numbers. And whenever Bishop Petrie, and after his death, Bishop Macfarlane, visited their flock, they were received with the utmost veneration wherever they went, travelling about under the most primitive conditions.

It is thanks to the zealous labours of such devoted

men—bishops, priest, and catechists—that to this day there still survive in the Diocese of Moray as many as four incumbencies continuous from the Revolution. They are represented by those of Arpafeelie (St. John's, Tore, Ross); Dingwall (St. James the Great); Fortrose (St. Andrew's), and Highfield (St. Mary's, Muir of Ord).

Chapter IX

THE WITNESS OF ABERDEEN: CITY AND COUNTY

I

Writing in 1638 from the city of Aberdeen to his friend, Mr. David Dickson, of sanguinary memory, that saint of the Covenant, Samuel Rutherford, had complained: "I cannot get a house in Aberdeen wherein to leave drink-siller[1] in my Master's name, save one only. There is no sale for Christ in the north; he is like to lay long on my hands ere any accept of him".

Translated into non-Covenanting language, this meant that the northern capital, a stronghold of loyalty to King Charles, had resisted the imposition of the Covenant. Naturally this could not be tolerated by its signatories, so they proceeded to the necessary coercive measures. In July 1638, therefore, a Covenanting commission which included the Earl (later Marquis) of Montrose and the three ministers, Alexander Henderson, Rutherford's friend Dickson, and Andrew Cant, arrived with copies of the precious document to be signed under compulsion. With its usual hospitality, Aberdeen, in the person of its magistrates, offered their unwelcome visitors "the cup of Bon Accord" (so called from the Corporation's motto) with other refreshments.

[1] A tip.

This hospitality, however, was spurned by the Covenanted, for it was not meet that they should join in any fellowship with publicans and sinners. Such refusal, nevertheless, was regarded as an insult "whereof the like was never done to Aberdeen in no man's memory".

Sunday came, and the Covenanting ministers, thwarted in their designs of occupying the pulpits of the city churches, were forced to preach elsewhere, and out of service hours, in order to secure any audience. A woman sympathizer supplied them with a platform—a wooden balcony of her house, overlooking a large yard. And preach the three men did, one after the other, and all through Monday as well, their sole theme, the Covenant.

But despite all this effort, they only succeeded in obtaining twenty recruits. For they had opposed to them the famous six "Aberdeen Doctors"—learned above all other learned men in the rest of Scotland and more than one of them of European reputation. They—John Forbes of Corse, and Baron, both professors of Divinity at the University; Sibbald and Ross of St. Nicholas's Church; Scroggie of St. Machar's Cathedral, and Leslie, principal of King's College, headed by their Bishop Bellenden, had drawn up and signed an Episcopalian confession of faith to oppose to the Covenant, and had presented fourteen demands to the Covenanting commissioners.

These, challenged to give authority, first, for the Covenant itself and then for its forcible imposition, plunged into a long and wearisome correspondence in addition to their preachings which had made so little

impression upon the people. Henderson was eloquent indeed upon the Scriptural character of the Covenant, but, with his colleagues, failed to meet the insistent inquiry of the doctors as to what right they had, even were it as Scriptural as represented, to force it upon people against their conscience. But, though the doughty six were undefeated, they were deposed for their defiance.

Elsewhere in the county where clergy had signed the Covenant under duress, they prayed to be forgiven, avowing that " they had rather fall into the hands of God by perjury, than into the hands of the Covenanters by beggary of themselves and families ". Some of these clergy, when faced with the objectionable document had been assured by Montrose that it did not pledge them "to act anything against the King ". Though Montrose may have argued himself into believing this, the clergy, not so subtle, must have felt, in view of subsequent events, that they had been tricked into signing.

Since the Covenanters had fared so ignominiously in their mission to Aberdeen, that loyal and Episcopalian city was marked down for vengeance. So on March 30, 1639, the Covenant's armed forces, supported after their wont by " voluntary subscriptions ", (largely forced) invaded the peaceful town. Some 9,000 rebels, headed by Montrose under the banner of " For Religion, the Covenant and the Country ", were marched through the city to overawe the Aberdonians. The Covenanters sported " Montrose's whimsies "—blue ribbons, one of the possible origins of the term " true blue Presbyterians ".

Intimidated by such a formidable army and the ferocious preachers who, of course, accompanied it, the town made no resistance. The bishop fled, Dr. Forbes retired to his estate of Corse, and 60 citizens with several clergy went off by sea to join the King. The citizens had to find quarters for Montrose's soldiers—a proceeding which instantly became an iniquity when practised by the other side—and not only were the Aberdonians forced to sign the Covenant but to swear that they did so "freely and willingly". In other words, the Covenanters, in accordance with their usual practice, made others break the third Commandment. Finally the poor Aberdonians were fined. The Covenanting dictators in Edinburgh had named 100,000 merks as the sum to be exacted from the "unnatural city" as a penalty for its stand for liberty of conscience. But Montrose, disposed to leniency in this respect, remitted the fine to 10,000 merks, greatly to the annoyance of the preachers.

Thirty-five miles by road from Aberdeen, there is on a hillside the attractive little town of Turriff, standing above the Idoch Water. Facing the remains of the old church there is, below on the left, the green hollow where the first blood in the Covenanting rebellion was shed. Here, on May 13, 1639, a small band of Covenanters was routed, and after this, the "Trot of Turriff", the victors, followed by the bishop, entered Aberdeen in triumph, only to be followed there, ten days later, by Montrose again.

Despite its usual lack of resistance the city never-

theless suffered somewhat from the Covenanting soldiery whilst Montrose and his officers were at Church on Sunday. On this occasion, however, the outstanding "sabbath observance" of the pious rioters was apparently their killing of all the dogs of the city. The poor animals were thus victimized because some of the women, in derision of the Covenanters' colours, had decked the dogs out in blue ribbons. Montrose, after levying another 10,000 merks on June 5, hastily retreated on a false alarm. Fourteen days later, however, he returned and forced the passage of the Dee against the loyalists who again held the city.

All visitors to Aberdeen find their way to the beautiful spot known alternatively as the Brig o' Balgownie, or the Old Brig of Don north of the city. Not so many, however, know its second bridge, 2½ miles S.W. of Aberdeen, though its seven arches are very fine. This old Bridge of Dee is substantially the same as that built in the sixteenth century by Bishop Dunbar, and here in June 1639, a two days' action was fought by the townsmen against the Montrose-led Covenanters. Whilst the men held the bridge, the courageous women of Aberdeen brought food to sustain them, but by a strategic act, Montrose was able to force the bridge, and again to enter the city for the last time—as a Covenanter. It was only by his cunning handling that his followers were restrained from their desire to sack, raze, and burn the town.

Aberdeen, however, became the scene of unbridled bestiality when next year an army of the Covenant arrived more forcibly to impose it upon the inhabi-

tants of the city and the country around. The leader of the rebels was a Major Munro who, like other Covenanting officers, had gained his experience in the Thirty Years' War. He brought a thousand debauched Covenanters into the city, and after he had exacted fines upon fines, he and his men seized the property of loyalists who had fled, plundered and destroyed the houses of loyal lairds in the neighbourhood, and forced unwilling Aberdonians to serve in his army.

Anticipating Hitler, Munro made it an offence even to express dislike of his régime. A poor weaver of Aberdeen, over seventy years of age, hastily uttered the wish that " all the rest would go that gait " when he heard that one of the Covenanting soldiers quartered near him had been accidentally drowned. He was at once taken off to prison and made to ride the " wooden mare ", a cruel instrument of punishment Munro had imported from Germany. But incomparably worse than all this was Munro's conduct in allowing his Covenanting soldiers every licence, which issued in the raping of young women of the poorer classes. These helpless victims of Covenanting lust were then left to suffer further punishment at the hands of others of the godly for the crimes of their violators.

In such fashion were the unfortunate Aberdonians brought under the heel of the Covenant, but when next, five years later, Montrose marched against the city, it was to punish it for having become what he himself had made it. For in the meantime he had changed sides.

Although Montrose had left the ranks of the Covenanters, he had not left them without some taint of that baseness which characterized his late associates as a body. Indeed, he himself as a Covenanter, had not stood altogether clear of Covenanting contamination. It was in April 1639, that he, playing "a mean and shabby part", had tricked the Marquis of Huntly, and then took him prisoner to Edinburgh. A year later Montrose had issued a not very convincing declaration vindicating his change of side, on the grounds of consistency. This the Aberdonians could scarcely be expected to appreciate, and since Montrose was no subordinate, but the King's lieutenant, he must be judged accordingly regarding his conduct in Aberdeen.

In the guise of a gallant cavalier (but no Bayard), the ex-Covenanting leader now came to Aberdeen, and sent by the hands of a drummer this letter [1] to the magistrates:—

> Loving Friends,
>
> Being here for the maintenance of religion and liberty, and His Majesty's just authority and service, these are, in His Majesty's name, to require you that immediately upon sight thereof you render and give up your town in the behalf of His Majesty; otherwise that all old persons, women and children, do come out and retire themselves, and that those who stay expect no quarter.
>
> I am, as you deserve,
>
> MONTROSE.

The drummer boy carrying a flag of truce was shot —but the culprit was not an Aberdonian. But this

[1] Still preserved in the Municipal Buildings, Aberdeen.

was Montrose's excuse for promising, in the savage spirit of the Covenanters, the sack of Aberdeen to Colkitto, and allowing his Irish lieutuenant to slay over 100 men and some women and children in cold blood.

Only a few days after Montrose had thus left Aberdeen, his arch-enemy Argyll, still faithful to the Covenant, entered the luckless city, quartering his three regiments upon the inhabitants and making large requisitions for their supply and entertainment. He went further than this, for he was the first to introduce fire-raising in Aberdeen.

II

The Church of St. Nicholas in the main street of [New] Aberdeen remains still as an example in part of the way in which all the great parish churches of Scotland (of which this was the largest,) were treated at the Reformation. The ancient transept, to which alone free access can be had daily, now serves as a vestibule to the two divisions, East and West, the former a nineteenth and the latter an eighteenth century rebuilding of the old Church.

The ex-Cathedral Church of St. Machar, the only ancient granite cathedral in Great Britain, is attractively situated in Old Aberdeen and is open daily for inspection. But the most beautiful building in Aberdeen is the Chapel of King's College, not far from the Cathedral, and the only original building of the college left. It contains a magnificent bronze reconstruction of the tomb of the founder, the good

Bishop Elphinstone, and is interesting in most of its features.

To Aberdeen in 1694 came a Commission of the General Assembly to enforce the Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church by disturbing the people and turning out their clergy for refusal to conform to Presbyterianism. A large number of these clergy gathered about the same time in King's College Chapel, and appointed a Committee to meet the Assembly's Commission. This Committee presented two documents, one of which consisted of questions challenging the right of 50 or 60 Presbyterian ministers to speak in the name of the Church of Scotland. The second was a formal protest against the recent Assemblies as in any sense representative of the National Church. The Episcopalian leader said " he would as soon acknowledge the conventicle of Trent to have been a true General Council as those of Edinburgh in 1690 and 1692 to have been true national synods ". Thus, again contemporaneously, was the affinity of Presbyterianism with Papalism noticed in one of its many points of contact.

Although the Presbyterian Commission completely ignored all the questions put to them, they succeeded in securing the submission of some of the clergy in the diocese, in depriving and imprisoning three of the protesters, under warrant from Cæsar, in the shape of the Privy Council, and in obtaining, for the first time, possession of St. Machar's Cathedral.

Amongst the city clergy to be turned out was Dr. George Garden, incumbent of St. Nicholas, who took with him his congregation which probably formed the

nucleus of the present Church of St. John in Crown Street. Though it was to his own people, in their own meeting-house, that Dr. Garden was ministering, he was summoned to appear before the General Assembly whose authority he naturally disclaimed. Nevertheless it proceeded to accuse him of teaching Bourignianism,[1] condemned him and deposed him from the ministry.

This new assumption of Papal Supremacy is interesting from the fact that the sentence pronounced on Dr. Garden proves clearly that none of the members of the General Assembly had ever read the works of Madame Bourignon. Nor, had they done so, would they have been capable of understanding her truly Catholic teaching on the inner life and her personal piety which, divorced from her unsound teaching, Dr. Garden had found and appreciated in her books.

Despite the orders of the local Presbytery, the Episcopalian clergy refused to read this sentence of deposition against Dr. Garden who, completely ignoring it, continued his ministrations amongst his people. We shall hear more of the valiant Dr. Garden later.

The greatest of all the sins of the Episcopalian clergy, however, was their employment of the Book of Common Prayer which in Queen Anne's reign came increasingly into use. This hated book, which they called " the English Mass ", roused the most violent opposition amongst the Presbyterians, who

[1] The mystical doctrines of a Flemish visionary, a woman who, at the age of 16, devoted herself to the religious life, though afterwards she left it.

even fought against its use by English chaplains when ministering to their own English regiments. So when in 1710 the Earl of Errol, as Chancellor of King's College, went the length of directing Dr. Middleton, the principal, to use the Prayer Book in the chapel, again an appeal was made to Cæsar. This time it was the Lord Advocate who issued the edict, and he wrote on the matter to Dr. Middleton, who apparently had been overlooked in the course of Presbyterianism's deposals. The "innovation" was no longer to be tolerated, and the chapel moreover was to be closed. Previously the same legal dignitary had threatened Mr. Dunbreck, chaplain to the Earl Marischal, after he had been charged by the Presbytery at Aberdeen and prosecuted, quite illegally, by the magistrates for using the English liturgy in his patron's own house.

Now we return to Dr. George Garden in 1716 when, it is to be remembered, the Toleration Act was still in force. He, with others of the Aberdeenshire clergy, was a staunch Jacobite, but although this was made the pretext for action against him, and them, their real offence was Episcopacy and the use of the Prayer Book. For whilst Episcopalian clergy were charged with reading the proclamation of James the Old Chevalier, or allowing it to be read from the pulpits of their churches, Presbyterian ministers who were guilty of the same offence went scot free. Dr. Garden was taken prisoner and with other clergy brought to Edinburgh. On the way they were shamefully treated, being thrust into a filthy dungeon amongst the worst of criminals, and in Edinburgh they were kept six months in gaol before being released on bail.

Also ministering in Aberdeen at the time was the Rev. John Gordon, a priest of the Church of England and a supporter of the Government. He took upon himself to officiate in a private house to a handful of people who had been deprived of their own priest. For Gordon's offence the Presbyterians influenced the magistrates to refuse to register his Letters of Orders, though they were legally required to do so. Nor was this all. In defiance of the Toleration Act, William Oliphant and John Andrew, two of Gordon's hearers in a private family, were banished from the city for this exercise of liberty of conscience.

Mr. John Gordon's congregation was probably the nucleus of that which ultimately built the present Church of St. Paul, Loch Street, some predecessor of which was apparently that "English Chapel" visited by Dr. Johnson. He says of it that "the congregation was numerous and splendid. The form of worship used by the Church of England is in Scotland legally practised in licensed chapels served by clergymen of English or Irish ordination". St. Paul's represents the oldest church, as distinct from a meeting-house, in Aberdeen.

Before leaving the city of Aberdeen for the county, other illegal acts of the Presbytery-goaded magistrates may be noticed. Three outstanding burghers were fined £20 Scots each, merely for refusing to give the names of the clergy who had baptized their infants. Further, these magistrates caused a drummer to go through the town announcing that those whose children were baptized by any but an Established Presbyterian minister were to be heavily fined.

We shall return to Aberdeen for the final scene, most fittingly to close this chapter and end the book.

III

"The last period of the Government of the Church of Scotland by Episcopacy (1661-1689) has left behind it generally in the North, and certainly in the district embraced between the Deveron and the Spey [part of Banffshire and Aberdeenshire] perhaps more pleasant memories than of any like period in the Church's history. Under the Bishop's benign rule the government of the Church was ordered and well regulated, and the poor and education received the attention they looked for in vain under both a previous and a subsequent régime. Episcopacy, moreover was in complete harmony with the feelings and wishes of the people and the clergy. In 1661 there was not one 'outed' minister in that district; in 1689, when Episcopacy was abolished, every minister, except the minister of Ordiquhill, refused to submit to the new order, and in certain of the parishes the people fought on behalf of the Episcopal minister for nearly 30 years".

"Throughout the whole of Aberdeenshire indeed the change [to Presbyterianism] was abhorred. In the Presbytery of Ellon, only two ministers were willing to conform—Anderson of Tarves and Fraser of Slains: the latter was so notorious for his lazy and careless habits that there can be little doubt he cast in his lot with the Presbyterian Church to escape the supervision and merited reproof of the Bishop".

"These [three bishops] help to explain the strength and virile quality of Episcopacy in the north, even at this day. In Aberdeenshire there are few parishes which have not their Episcopal Church . . . and these churches are supported with a loyalty and unwavering allegiance that have baffled the casual student of matters ecclesiastical".

Than these three testimonies from two modern Presbyterians, one an elder, the other a parish minister, there could be no better introduction to the tale of the indomitable energies of the Presbyterians in trying to supplant the Episcopalian incumbents of Aberdeenshire.

Let us go to that north-east corner of the county known as Buchan, a district bounded by the river Deveron with its mouth on the north coast, and that of the Ythan which gains the sea on the east. Here, to take a typical example, the members of the Presbytery of Deer, which comprised ten parishes, mostly occupied by devoted Episcopalian incumbents, strove hard to turn these out. But they ignominiously failed, and having no affairs of their own with which to occupy themselves, this Presbytery, like so many more, busied themselves with other people's concerns. Again they had no return for their enterprise.

The whole of the records of the Presbytery of Deer for ten years, beginning from 1701, is exclusively concerned with this self-appointed interference. In the true and unbroken Presbyterian succession and as faithful sons of the Covenant, they for nearly a year attempted to coerce the schoolmasters into signing the

Westminster Confession. This they refused to do. The Episcopalians, of course, observed the popish festival of Christmas, so the Presbytery of Deer received instructions from the Synod of Aberdeen to "appoint their commissioners to the next General Assembly to represent the great abuse made at Yool, and show that some Episcopal ministers preach that day". There were also to be censured those in Episcopalian strongholds who were Sabbath breakers. One William Cruden, of Lonmay, was summoned to attend the next meeting of the Presbytery because he "was found travelling on the Lord's Day . . . with a burden on his back".

As regards the ten years' attempt of this devotedly diligent Presbytery to obtain a footing for their nominees in the parishes, the cases of Fraserburgh and Old Deer will serve as typical of the rest. In the main, the procedure exactly followed that already described in the previous chapter as having taken place at Rathven.[1] Here, as there, that procedure met with precisely the same opposition from both patron and parishioners—all staunch Episcopalians—and differed only in certain local details which provide features of general interest.

To-day in Fraserburgh the congregation of the very handsome and beautiful Bishop Jolly Memorial Church of St. Peter represents the old Episcopalians of that town. It was the Rev. Alex Moore—the choice of the heritors [2] and people alike—and his curate, the

[1] Not to be identified with the parish of Rathen in this Presbytery. See p. 263 *et seq*.

[2] Lord Saltoun, the principal one, was a staunch supporter of the Government.

Rev. Alex. Craig, of whom the Presbytery wished to rid the parish. But contrariwise, the parish wished to be rid of them and their nominee, and found in mud, stones, and other missiles in alliance with drum-beating and other noises, effective means to demonstrate their desires. As all approach to the church was effectively barred, the Presbytery was obliged to resort to the one friendly house in the parish, there to ordain their presentee.

After this event, the Presbytery recorded that "Mr. Alex. Craig and Mr. Alex. Moore, intruders at Fraserburgh . . . continue all the parts of the Ministerial function in the said town and parish, in preaching, baptising, and marrying, although the said Mr. Moore either be not in orders, or if he have gotten ordination [which he had,] it is from one of the exauctorate [deposed] bishops, from Haliburton, late Bishop of Aberdeen".

It will be observed that in this Presbyterian estimate of ordination, Holy Orders ceased to be Holy Orders when the bishop who had conferred them was deposed by Cæsar,[1] the things of God and the things of Cæsar thus being made identical. Worse still, however, than their invalid orders in the eyes of the Presbytery, the same two culprits "have got up the English service there, and tho' in their worship they stick close to their form of words in that book, yet when they come to that paragraph wherein the Queen's Majesty is mentioned, they do pass it by, praying for our dread Sovereign—they are not qualified, are supposed to be of erroneous principles, do

[1] See p. 91.

admit scandalous persons to the sealing ordinances [the two Sacraments] and countenance excommunicate persons ". [from the Presbyterians.]

Several baillies and tradesmen of Fraserburgh were summoned by the Presbytery to bear witness against Mr. Moore and Mr. Craig, who themselves declined to appear. And though most of the witnesses came, they all, despite the moderator's threats, absolutely refused to give any witness against their clergy. Previously a Presbyterian from outside the Parish had brought ' evidence ' against Mr. Moore and had been questioned upon oath. Six months beforehand this young man had heard Mr. Moore preach. He had not then taken down the sermon, nor yet any notes of it, but nevertheless he was able to read from a long paper what he *thought* Mr. Moore had meant. He also stated that Mr. Moore had preached further to the same effect in the afternoon. Unfortunately for his credibility, however, it was proved that Mr. Moore had not preached at all that afternoon—the afternoon sermon being as mythical as the "supposed erroneous principles ".

The pleasant village of Old Deer may be called in a double sense the heart of Buchan, because it is the centre of that district and also the site of the oldest monastery in Aberdeenshire, that of St. Drostan, founded in the sixth or seventh century. On the outskirts of the village are still to be seen the interesting ruins of the Cistercian Abbey that succeeded, but not on the same site, the older monastery. Originating there, and passing into the possession of its successor, the famous *Book of Deer* is now in Cambridge

University Library. Its earliest writings are of the ninth century, the services and part of the Gospels with marginal notes of later date in Gaelic, believed to be the earliest specimens of Scottish Gaelic writing.

Leaving the ruins of the monastery for the village, we find, at the end of the long street, the ruins of the old pre-Reformation Church of Deer, "restored" as far as they have been restored, without any knowledge as to where the various fallen parts of the fabric belonged. The result is a most extraordinary medley of wrong rebuilding.

Long before this happened, however, there took place, in 1711, the renowned "Rabbling of Deer" of which the old church of Deer was the scene. The Rev. George Keith, who had been appointed Episcopalian incumbent in 1683, remained unmolested till his death in 1710. The great majority of the parishioners being Episcopalians, the Rev. William Livingstone, then a deacon, was elected to succeed him.

Nevertheless, the Presbytery attempted to go through the empty performance of "preaching the Church vacant". Twice the attempt was made by different ministers, neither of whom was allowed to get near the church, and who complained of being so insulted and menaced by the crowd that they were forced to withdraw to a sympathizer's house and there deliver their sermons.

Nevertheless, the prescribed preliminary formalities having thus been curiously completed, all things were now ready for a "new minister of the Government" (to use the Presbytery's own description), to

be "planted". The Presbytery's presentee, Mr. John Gordon, was the son of the Provost of Aberdeen, who with many friends and a military bodyguard, accompanied the Presbytery to see his heir safely forced upon the parish.

The induction party set out from Aberdeen at nightfall, but before they reached Old Deer, some were sent in advance to reconnoitre. They found the people fully prepared for them, for at the entrance to the village, the company from Aberdeen were held up by a body of men and women who opposed them with scarecrows, plough staves, flails, and other rustic implements. With these weapons the indignant parishioners fell upon the invaders, wounding their leader and unhorsing the troopers. They then proceeded to seize both their ammunition and commissariat.

Notwithstanding this set-back, next day the military ordination party advanced—with the Presbyterian ministers well in the rear. Seeing none of the villagers about, however, the invaders were encouraged to advance boldly, but when they reached the church they found both it and the churchyard gate locked and barricaded with stones. Ordered to force this gate open, the induction party moved forward "unto a narrow passe", when "the house tops fill full of people with stones, etcs., which they throw down upon them standing all together in the passe, and hurt some ministers and others". The military bodyguard replied with shots from their guns, wounding several of their opponents. Maddened by this, the parishioners, men and women alike, rushed upon the

armed forces, and such was the power with which their indignation endued them, that the ordination party was utterly routed. Mr. Gordon had to go elsewhere for his ordination, and the victorious parishioners recuperated themselves by the feast which had been ordered by the invaders to celebrate their success.

Although the people of Old Deer triumphed on this notable occasion, their priest Livingstone, his wife, and child were ultimately turned out of the manse and into the snow, causing the infant's death. In consequence of this, it was foretold that from that time never a cradle should rock in that manse. Nor has it yet.

The present successor to the Episcopalians' various meeting-houses [1] and chapels, is the little church of St. Drostan, within sight of the scene of the famous rabbling. Walking round the interior, one is surprised to come across, on the south side of the chancel a stained-glass window, beneath which is a brass with this inscription: "Sacred to the memory of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, who died in the arms of Victory, and whose battle-cry was 'King James and the Church of Scotland'".

Suddenly this sight revived the recollection of a statement that the body of the great Dundee had been disinterred from "the vaults of Athol" and re-interred in Old Deer. If there were any truth in that statement, how came this to happen? The present rector, after much inquiry, at last heard the following

[1] There is a cottage used for this purpose still standing at Stewartfield, near by.

curious story from the granddaughter of his predecessor concerned.

This was Dean Ranken, the rector from 1834 to 1886, an honoured priest and very well known for his strong Jacobite sympathies and particular devotion to Claverhouse. A friend of his managed to get access to the vault in old Blair Church, and thinking to please the Dean, actually lifted some of Claverhouse's bones and sent them to him at the Rectory of Old Deer! So far from being pleased, the Dean was greatly embarrassed and troubled by being made the recipient of the proceeds of such a violation. His natural instinct was to return the relics to Blair Athol, but he feared this course would get his friend into trouble. So at the traditional hour of midnight, the Dean made his way into St. Drostan's, and lifting some tiles underneath the south window in the chancel, reverently deposited the relics in a cavity he made beneath them. It is easy to recognize the exact tiles removed, for they were slightly chipped at the edges in the process.

IV

Such success as the Presbyteries of Aberdeenshire had achieved in their "planting" efforts, was often wholly thwarted by the persistence of the Episcopalian clergy in continuing to minister to their flocks. In this they had—nominally—the protection of the Toleration Act which had been passed in the interests of the Episcopalian Communion, and expressly declared: "That no civil pain, forfeiture, or disability

whatsoever shall be in any wise incurred by reason of any excommunication by the Church judicatories in Scotland: and all magistrates are expressly prohibited and discharged to force any person to appear when summoned, or to give obedience to any such sentence when pronounced; any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding ".

But the Aberdeenshire magistrates and other authorities, like many others elsewhere in Scotland, appear to have been either tools in the hands of the Presbyteries, or themselves Presbyterians in the Covenanting succession. Certainly they did not concern themselves to " truly and impartially minister justice to the punishment of wickedness and vice ". On the contrary. Not only did they follow the example of the unjust judge, but they bore false witness by their patently untruthful statements in a negation, instead of in a " maintenance of true religion and virtue ". So, in the interests of the Presbyterian tradition, Lieutenant-Deputes, Sheriff-Substitutes, and Justices of the Peace set the law at defiance.

It was in 1716 that the Presbyteries felt that it was now high time that their (officially) unaided efforts to extirpate Episcopacy in the parishes should receive more effective backing, and that from the civil and military authorities. As the result, an " Advertisement by the Justices of the Peace of the County of Aberdeen " was sent out to all the Episcopalian clergy. This accused them not only, truthfully, of continuing their ministrations, but untruthfully, of raising, abetting, and encouraging " unlawful riots

and tumults", whereas it was common knowledge that the clergy had invariably conducted themselves peaceably; that but for their interposing, there would have been more and worse riotings; and that such as had taken place occurred despite their efforts. The "Advertisement", now abandoning truth completely, continued: "And the said Justices of the Peace being ordained by the Laws and Acts of Parliament to cause the sentences of the Establish'd Church to be obeyed and put to due Execution; and all riotous Assemblies and Tumults being by a late Act of the British Parliament punishable by death, and the said Justices of the Peace being resolved, according to the Trust committed to them, to put the Laws to due Execution", then proceed at length in words of which the following is the purport: The Episcopalian clergy were forbidden to continue their ministrations even in their own homes, excepting only "before those in their own family", and, in conclusion, the "Advertisement" was to be read in all the parish churches of the county after service on the Sunday after its receipt.

This publication, however, had no effect, so the same civic authorities addressed a letter to each of the contumacious clergy. As they had entirely failed to respond to the injunctions of the Advertisement, they are severally informed that since "you are still preaching in Church or House, and refusing access to the Presbytery, upon which account Application was made to General Carpenter .... to give orders to the Commandant of His Majesty's Forces at this place [Aberdeen] to afford Parties wherever desired ....

you may be assured we will forthwith order a Party for apprehending your Person and procuring Access to your Church ". This would take place if the clergy refused the " intreaty " of the letter to deliver over the keys of the church to the Presbytery, and to satisfy the Presbytery that it would be no more troubled by further Episcopalian ministrations.

Meeting with no better success than its predecessor, the Advertisement, this letter was followed by orders to send a party of soldiers on December 29th, 1716, to Cruden, St. Fergus, and Pitsligo—the two former places on the coast, below and above Peterhead respectively. A party of dragoons, under the supreme authority of Strachan of Glenkindie, therefore set out on a Saturday afternoon and seized each of these churches. They broke open their doors and turned them into guard houses, kindling fires inside and bringing in their beds. Then they ate, drank, and played cards till the Sunday morning, when, at the usual hour of service, they guarded every approach to the church to make sure the priest did not enter.

The letter authorizing these actions was headed " Glenkindie and Mr. Forbes, Sheriff-Substitute, their orders to the soldiers to take Possession of the Churches ", and this was the specific one concerning Mr. William Dunbar of Cruden, subsequently to become first, Bishop of Moray, and then of Aberdeen.

" Whereas we are required by the Presbytery of Ellon to give Access to the Ministers of the Established Government unto the Church of Cruden. . . . These are therefore desiring and commanding you, William McKeldnie, and the men under your Com-

mand, to march to the Kirk of Cruden, and take Possession of the said Church . . . . and upon the . . . . Sabbath you are to admit a Minister of the Established Government to preach at the said Church, and to debar the late Incumbent, Mr. Dunbar, therefrom. And after Divine Service, you are to deliver the Keys of the said Church to the Minister of the Established Government."

Dunbar was an avowed Jacobite, and as such he would have been rightly charged and tried by a civil court. But he declined the jurisdiction of the Presbytery both for this reason and because, as an Episcopalian, he repudiated them. By the order of the Presbytery, however, its Moderator specifically assured Mr. Dunbar that the head and forefront of his offence was his introduction of the "English service book and ceremonies".

On the appointed Sunday, his military supporters enabled a Presbyterian minister to enter the pulpit of Cruden, but the church that had been "preached vacant" by the Presbyterians, remained so to them. Not a single parishioner was present—his armed guard was the preacher's sole audience. He preached to them—no doubt a moving sermon—from the text: "Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was let hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles" (Romans i, 13).

Just on the outskirts of Buchan, on the north-west border of Aberdeenshire, lies the parish of Forgue in the Presbytery of Turriff. Here the Rev. John

Maitland, the Episcopalian incumbent, had long ministered to the parishioners, who, devoted to him, had time and again prevented Presbyterian emissaries from ejecting him. This good priest, an ex-member of the Presbytery of Turriff, had been a convert from Presbyterianism together with his more famous brother James, and both had been ordained by the Bishop of Aberdeen.

Expelled at last from Forgue Kirk by the soldiery, Mr. John Maitland received a letter from the Sheriff-Substitute, dated November 9th, 1716, nine months after the rising of '15 was ended. It ran:

> I meet with several Complaints against you as a Disturber of the Government and Incendiary in the Country you live in, which I am apt to believe, since your Principles and Actings in the Time of the Rebellion are very well known to me. I am very loth to meddle with any that once had your character, but your persisting in the ways of Rebellion, will oblige me to look after you I therefore send you this intimation, that you forthwith remove yourself and Family from the Manse of Forgue, and give over your pretended ministerial Function within that Parioch [parish], or otherwise, depend upon it, I'll take all methods to seize your Person, and bring you to Tryal for High Treason; in order to which, upon your Return to me (if not satisfactory) I will cause send a Party of the Forces to lye at Turriff allenarly [solely] upon your account.

Here follow extracts from Mr. Maitland's lengthy reply. For the sake of brevity, expressions of due deference to the Sheriff-Substitute's office, and other

courtesies, are omitted, and it has been broken into paragraphs.

I do not question you meet with many complaints and loud outcries against me, but am not sensible I have given just Grounds or Occasion for them and . . . . it is very becoming and necessary not to listen to those, who are known to be very much prejudiced against me. I know that he whom (though most unfit and unworthy) I serve in the Gospel, was traduced and represented as a Mover of Sedition, and Perverter of the Nation, though his Doctrine and Example had no tendency that way, but the contrary; and the Disciple is not above the Master.

You are pleased to say, that you are very loth to meddle with any that once had my Character; and I leave to tell you, that my Character is altered much to the Advantage, having received Ordination from the Hands of an Orthodox Bishop, and therefore I am a truly authorized Minister of the Gospel, with which my mind (agreeable to the sentiments of the Catholic Church in all Ages, founded upon the clearest and most convincing Reasons, drawn from Scripture and Apostolical Tradition) is so fully satisfied, that I would not, for any worldly considerations, part with the latter and take with the former. . . .

As to [my pretended ministerial Function], you will perceive from what is above, that I am in *Holy Orders*, so that my Ministerial Function is not pretended. Farther, you may be pleased to consider that I exercise my office on the Lord's Day *within my own House only*; and what less can be expected from any clergyman? And though several others come to be my Hearers, yet I have no Maintenance from them; and I presume it will appear to yourself as it does to me, that it would be

extremely indecent and unbecoming on my Part to shut the doors against them.

As these oustings from the manses did not proceed fast enough to please the Presbyteries, early in 1717 they took out " Decreets of Ejection " against the Episcopalian clergy before the Sheriff of the County. These orders were all the more readily obtained and put into execution since the Sheriff was encouraged to turn out as many clergy as possible by the offer of a reward of 100 merks Scots from each Presbyterian entrant into the coveted manse.

In such fashion was justice travestied in Presbyterian interests throughout the county. Clergy had been listed on the same roll as the most scandalous malefactors and prosecuted before Commissioners of Justiciary, when they were refused the benefit of the Queen's indemnity then published, though this was granted to the malefactors.

Mr. Guthrie, for preaching in his manse at Fetteresso after the Presbyterians turned him out, was banished from the shire though the jury brought him in not guilty. Some time after, Mr. Hay, priest at Aberlour, was banished the Kingdom for baptising a child. And in one parish the Presbyterian minister of Daviot actually took possession of two Communion cups inscribed " To the Episcopal congregation at Micklefolla," now represented by St. George's Church, Follarule. Instead of returning these two, the Presbytery gave the church a chalice, still used, inscribed " Patrick Lunan, 1738," to which also they had no right, as he was the

priest who ministered in the parish from 1731 to 1763.

The following extracts are some made from the document mentioned in the Preface, p. 31, (to which reference should be made) as that sent to the author by the Bishop of Aberdeen. It is a lengthy MS., and has, therefore, been cut down by more than two-thirds.

The selections have been made to show the strong attachment of the petitioners to the old Disestablished Church, and their full grasp of sound Catholic principles in respect of Episcopacy and the sin of schism. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that only in Queen Anne's reign, with its introduction of the English Prayer Book, had the Church greatly increased her few previous differences in worship from that of Presbyterianism.

Unfortunately, many moving expressions of devotion to the teaching of the Gospels have thus been excluded, so that little is left to show the genuine piety of the petitioners.

The document has been broken up into paragraphs to make easier reading.

The Humble Address of the poor farmers and others of the Episcopal Communion in and about [?]

To the Quality and Gentry in those Parts. Our worthy and much honoured Masters.

May it please your Honours: It gives us great grief to find that you are somehow or other so highly displeas'd at us at this time, as to threaten to lay hardships and difficulties upon the enjoyment of our religion and worship. . . . We always have been and still are willing

to submit to all your demands and commands in worldly matters, however harsh and disagreeable these might perhaps at first sight appear to us:

For we have been taught that these things are your Property and Province. And accordingly we have yielded to all that you have requir'd of us and departed from any title we might once have pretended to in things of that kind. You have changed our old Farms You have rais'd our old Rents. You have taken possession of all our old money: And there is now no old thing remaining with us that we can call our own, but our old wives and our old religion. The first of these can be of little use to your Honours: So we are in no danger of being call'd upon to part wt them.

But the other, our Religion is we fear to be taken from us, for what reason we know not. And therefore we have taken upon us to supplicate your Honours for liberty to keep it, hoping you will be favourable to us, and indulge us in our request when you have heard our reason for making it. It will do us great damage to take our good old religion from us: It is all the comfort we have in life, and the only thing that can give us any joy . . . . If this shall be taken from us, what have we remaining to make life tolerable? . . . .

It can neither bring pleasure nor profit to y. H. to take our Religion from us. For tho' you take it from us, we do not think you will incline to take it to yourselves. It is too old and vulgar now for people of taste and fashion to make use of it. And accordingly we have heard our late Minister (rest his soul) say that the Gentry had got a new religion of their own among them: We have forgot how he call'd it, as we are not book learn'd enough to remember examn.[1] names: But by the de-

[1] Examination.

scription he gave of it, we took it to be fitter for your Honours and more suitable to your breeding and manner of life than ours is.

For it is but decent that you who are so highly exalted above us in every other circumstance should be distinguished from us in Religion too. . . . When it [the Gospel] speaks to us of a Saviour for fallen Men and promises pardon thro' her merits to poor sinners, tho' we cannot dispute about it or philosophise upon it, we can and do feel a wonderful and inexpressible gladness in our hearts from it. . . .

This therefore is our lamentation lest this benefit be deny'd us: We dread it mightily, and we are griev'd to see that our fears are not without foundation. For, may we ask your Hs.[1] what else could be the meaning of that strange solemnity of locking up the doors of a house where some of us us'd to conveen for religious worship, on the very day that one of our ministers was bury'd, and before his grave was fully cover'd?

Indeed we could not but be frighten'd when we heard that the Gentleman who perform'd that office call'd us a parcel of nonjurors. What he meant by that word we know not: it has a conjuring sound, and we do not understand it. Sure we are we never intended to injure him. . . .

What worse is our Religion now than it was formerly? When honest old Episcopacy was hurrl'd out of the Kirks, and an out of the way thing called Presbytery set up in its Room, it is to be remember'd that your Fathers and Predecessors, our then honoured masters did then encourage us to adhere to what we were persuaded was the true Church, and did both countenance and assist us in erecting Houses of Worship for that

[1] Honours.

purpose: In that Persuasion we have all along continued: And have not as yet met wt. anything to convince our understandings, such as they are, that we have been in the wrong:

Our old Episcopal Ministers have preached the pure Word of God to us and both by their private conversation and publick doctrine have been of great use to instruct us in the duties, and comfort our dejected spirits with the promises of Religion. And wou'd your Hs.[1] really take such useful men from us, or hinder us from receiving the benefit of their ministrations without laying anything to their charge, or proving any new fault upon them? . . .

You would not propose us to give up wt. Religion altogether, or to renounce our old Episcopal Principles wch we have been bred with, and wch many of your Hs. seem even yet to be in some measure fond of.

No, you tell us, let us have minds that are qualify'd according to Law, and you will both assist and protect us: But whence or where, or how are they to be had? Why you say as Law direct, from England. Really, may it please your Hs. tho' we have heard of that kind of men, we cannot say that we are acquainted with them: We know nothing about them, nor about the Bishops who, they say, ordain them. We have always had Bps. among ourselves in Scotland, and we cannot without great force upon our consciences, depart from the obedience that we owe to them. . . .

There is no other scheme of Church matters that will please us so well or do us much good. . . . And your Hs. will remember the old observation, that forc'd prayers are no devotion. We cannot as yet think, (tho' we know not what we may be brought to) of playing the hypocrite wt. God Almighty: And we much fear any change of or deviation from our old way of worship,

if your Hs. will insist upon it, would produce this unbecoming, and to us dreadful effect. . . .

We hope your Hs. will pardon the plainness of this Expostulation, and grant us this earnest, this easy desire of our hearts: It is all that we think worth the having, It is all that is left to us worth the asking: Let our hopes be answer'd: . . . We will continue to pray, that God may indue your Hs. wt. Grace, Wisdom and Understanding, and may enrich you not only wt. temporal riches, but, wch. we humbly think far preferable, wt. spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus.

Amen

V

The Episcopalian meeting-house of Aberdeen which had been burnt down by Cumberland was in an out-of-the-way place at the back of the Tolbooth in Broad Street, and when the eminent John Skinner,[1] younger of Linshart, came to minister to the congregation—now represented by St. Andrew's Cathedral [2]—it was accommodated in the upper room of a miserable house within a close of Guestrow which runs parallel with Broad Street. The Episcopalians speedily outgrew this, and when in 1776

[1] His father, John, priest of Longside, was more widely famous as a song writer He was the author of *Tullochgorum* and *The Ewie Wi' the Crookit Horn*. In consequence of these writings, as well as for his Church principles, he was thrown into Old Aberdeen Jail, where his devoted son, then aged only nine, insisted on accompanying him

[2] This dark and somewhat depressing building in King Street, redeemed by its worshipful plenishings, contains a strikingly life-like statue of Bishop John Skinner, by Flaxman.

John Skinner, afterwards to be Bishop, built himself a large dwelling in Longacre, which lay between the present Broad and W. North Streets, he fitted up the upper floor as a new meeting-house. It was but a poor place of worship as regards its appointments, for it was very scantily furnished, and the " bishop's throne " was only a mahogany chair " worth a shilling or two ". Yet here on Sunday, November 14th, 1784, there met, almost in secret, a congregation to witness a ceremony of the greatest moment. For the honour of giving the Apostolic Succession to the Anglican Communion in America had fallen upon Scotland's Faithful Remnant, the despised and still suffering disestablished old Church of Scotland.

Samuel Seabury had been chosen as bishop-elect by the clergy of Connecticut and had come to England for consecration. But as an American citizen, he could not take the oath of allegiance to to the British Sovereign required of all to be consecrated to the Episcopate by the English bishops. There was, naturally, no such requirement exacted of bishops consecrated by the Scottish college, so to Scotland Seabury went.

Nothing more unlike the usual stately service of the consecration of a bishop in some beautiful cathedral with its organ and choir could be imagined than the plain and truly simple service in that humble upper room in Aberdeen. But there were, of course, the canonical number of bishops to consecrate—the Primus, Kilgour, Bishop of Aberdeen, his co-adjutor, John Skinner, and Arthur Petrie of

Moray and Ross—and both in this respect and by their use of the English Ordinal, all the essentials for a valid and regular consecration were secured. The consecrating bishops, however, as well as he on whom they laid hands, were alike sombrely vested in black gowns.

After the solemn ceremony was ended, a concordat was drawn up by the four bishops in synod, "between the Catholic remainder of the ancient Church of Scotland and the new rising Church in Connecticut". In the chief article of those then drawn up, Bishop Seabury promised to sanction the Scottish Communion Office in America if he found it "agreeable to the genuine standards of antiquity". This he did, and in 1786 adopted it with some slight alterations, and on this liturgy was subsequently modelled the American Office in 1789.

When Bishop Seabury returned to Connecticut, he was enthusiastically welcomed by his clergy, who in their address to him said, in reference to the Scottish bishops, "wherever the American Episcopal Church shall be mentioned in the world, may this good deed, which they have done for us, be spoken for a memorial of them."

Bishop Skinner's house, in which this historic scene took place, has long since been pulled down. Longacre itself has also disappeared. All that now commemorates the great event near where it took place is a tablet of polished granite on an outside wall in the back premises of the Marischal College. Anyone desirous of seeing this must ask the porter to conduct him to the spot, which is only reached by

diving into a basement and following devious ways. An inscription below a mitre states that:

> This tablet is by permission of the authorities erected by Churchmen of Connecticut to preserve the memory of the place in Long Acre, very near this spot, where on Nov. 14, 1784, Samuel Seabury, D.D. [of Oxford] was consecrated the first Bishop of the Church in America.

Below is engraved the seal of the Republic of Connecticut.

VI

The tale of Scotland's suppressed history has now been told in brief, but in part only. Such important centres as St. Andrew's, Dundee, Perth, and Inverness have been left unvisited, not because they have not also their story of Episcopalians reduced by relentless persecution to " the shadow of a shade ", but because their history is but a variant of that already related of other places.

Poor and despised as the Scottish Episcopal Church still is: because of the smallness of her numbers deemed a meet subject for slight and sarcasm, yet has not her Divine Head spoken:

" *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for My sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven.*"

Appendix to Chapter IX

The *Mystics of the North-East* is a volume just published by the Third Spalding Club of Aberdeen. It is edited and introduced by Dr. Henderson, Regius Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen, and is a noble tribute by a Presbyterian minister—*O si sic omnia!*—to the deep piety of outstanding Episcopalians—laity as well as clergy—of this part of Scotland. Where, in other districts, the strife of ecclesiasticism was the main interest, here, in a stronghold of Episcopalianism, we see the deeply religious spirit of lovable, humble-minded Christian men who concentrated on liturgical worship, as distinct from preaching, and personal religion as opposed to Calvinistic dogmatism. For this they were denounced as heretics by Presbyterianism.

PETITION TO QUEEN ANNE

From the Kildrummy Papers, 1680–1717

To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty—

The humble petition of the Heritors of the Reformed Religion, the Elders and other the Indwellers of the paroch of Cabrach, lying within the Diocie of Aberdeen,

Sheweth

That your Majesty's most loyal, most affectionate and dutiful subjects and suppliants being abundantly sensible of your royal tenderness and care for the common good of all your people, without respect of parties—This your so pious and unbiassed zeal as it has deservedly gained your Majesty the hearts and veneration of all good subjects, so it encourages us though otherwise so mean and inconsiderable as living at a remote distance from the throne and in a cold northern climate, yet not without a true warmth for those Christian Catholic principles, wherein we have been happily initiated, and hitherto without wavering, have steadily professed humbly to remonstrate. That whereas we were of late by the decease of our pious and worthy Episcopal pastor left as desolate orphans, as sheep without a Shepherd, did, (therefore, all of us

unanimously to prevent the encroachments of ravenous wolves,) call and invite Mr. George Strachan, to officiate to us in holy Things—one who has complied with the Civil Government and taken the oaths to your Majesty, of whose learning, loyalty and unblameable life we have the utmost assurance. We persuaded ourselves that our neighbours of the presbyterian persuasion whose government stands upon the foot of the inclinations of the people—(Since they knew well enough there was not one single person in all this paroch of their communion) would not obtrude themselves upon an unwilling people, but suffer us peaceably to enjoy a minister of our own principles. But contrary to our expectations we find that, without all regard to our Call, they resolve to thrust in upon us, to spite us the more, some raw, witless, ignorant and inexperienced stripling, the consequences whereof may prove very dangerous by opening a wide door to popish missionaries who have already got some footing here and may come to reap but too plentiful a harvest among stomached and prejudicat people, if our present teacher be driven away from us, whom they threaten to persecute with Council letters, and are processing before their presbytery. And now in this our perplexed circumstances, we have none under God to fly to for sanctuary but God's Vicegerent, your anointed Majesty. We do hereby with the profoundest submission, implore your royal protection that your Majesty would grant ease and relief to our consciences, for we are convinced that we

cannot safely abandon our ancient Communion which we judge agreeable to the Word of God, and thus cut ourselves off from the whole Catholic Church under heaven, by incorporating with a Society we fear may be in a state of schism. We doubt much whether their mission and orders be valid, and apprehend their Sacraments are ineffectual, and he that doubts is damned, if he partake with them till satisfied in his scruples, for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.

We cannot endure to hold the Divine worship among us mutilate, by being deprived of the public reading of the Scriptures, our Lord's incomparable prayer, and that primitive summary of our faith the Doxology. We judge it an insufferable usurpation to have the Westminster Confession foisted in at Baptism in lieu of the Apostle's Creed, and so our children instead of being entered into the Christian Religion, made proselytes to a faction. We reckon it a tyrannical domination, a cruel lording it over our faith, and the very spirit of popery, to require us, many among us being but simple and illiterate men, an implicit belief of we know not what, a large and bulky confesssion and Catechisms, containing many of the abstrusest and most thornie points in all the School Divinity, and to take us engaged to educate our children therein. We cannot see how we can swallow all this down by the lump without taking God's name in vain. We tremble to think of polluted sacrifices by the rude and slovenly addresses of some rash young men in their babbling rhapsodies to the adorable

and infinitely pure and jealous God. And we honest countrymen, whose principle it is to fear God and honour our Sovereign, and not to meddle with those who are given to Changes, cannot abide to have one of the Associating Crew among us, who by their new Covenants and bonds profess themselves independent upon secular powers or temporal princes, lest in time they come to debauch us in our loyalty (and we (come to) hear them domineer in our chaste pulpit, with the old "Curse ye Meroz, &c.")

May it therefore please your Majesty to put a stop to their violent proceedings against the young man we have made choice of to be our minister and to grant him a right to the legal stipend that so we may have the comfort of a true pastor to bless us in God's Name, to offer up pure incense and to divide the Word of Truth aright, and give us our portion of bread in due season, and who in the Celebration of the Heavenly Mysteries, may consecrate in the words of our Blessed Saviour's Institution, and so ease us of our jealousies and fears of receiving a stone instead of bread.

We passionately upon our knees beseech your Serene Majesty graciously to vouchsafe us this favour, who value no earthly thing so dear as our consciences. We wait prostrate for a refreshing answer, and hope we shall have no cause to say as that Greekish suppliant that appealed from King Philip sleeping to King Philip awake—Whatever the issue may be we shall ever study to approve ourselves for our loyalty and peaceable submission

to Government. May the Almighty God by Whom Kings reign defend your Majesty's sacred person from all intestine plots and outlandish foes. May your reign be illustrious and happy, and may there never want one of the ancient and royal race of the clement and merciful Stuarts to sway the British Sceptre while the sun and moon shall endure.

So prays . . .

AUTHOR'S NOTE.—This document is invaluable as shewing, not only the tenacity of Catholic principles by the old disestablished Church of Scotland as opposed to Presbyterianism, but the identity of her fundamental position with that of her sister Church of England then as now. "Our ancient Communion which we judge agreeable to the Word of God", is opposed to that "persuasion whose government stands upon the foot of the inclinations of the people" to join which might involve sin, with its contingencies, as set forth. The petition will also serve to dispose of the common delusion that "High Church" principles, as these (though all implicit where not explicit in the Prayer Book) are popularly termed, were only imported into Scotland during the middle of the last century from Oxford by the Tractarians.

Any departure on the part of the old Scottish as well as the English Church from their historical position would involve the renunciation of a unique heritage—Catholic as well as reformed.

SOME BOOKS RECOMMENDED TO READERS

I. By Presbyterian Writers

The Columban Church, by Dr. J. A. Duke, 1932.

**Annals of the Church in Scotland*. Sir Thomas Raleigh, 1921.

**Puritanism in the Scottish Church*. Dr. W. S. Provand, 1923.

**Montrose*. John Buchan, 1928.

These are all writen in a just and fair spirit.

**The Covenanters*. Two volumes by Dr. J. K. Hewison, 1913.

**Men of the Covenant*. Dr. A. Smellie. 1st published at 7*s*. 6*d*., Nov. 1903. 2nd impression, Dec. 1903. 2nd edition, June 1904. 4th impression, Dec. 1904. Popular edition (5,000 copies), at 2*s*. 6*d*., 1905. Edition de Luxe (920 copies) in 2 vols., 31*s*. 6*d*., Jan. 1909. New edition, reset, 7*s*. 6*d*. net. Aug. 1909. Popular edition (5,400 copies), 2*s*. 6*d*., Jan. 1911.

These books are at the two extremes. The first stands alone in being an exhaustive (and exhausting) work, which *The Times* described as " thoroughly uncritical " and showing " no real wish to face the facts ". It is entirely characteristic of the truculent Covenanting spirit.

Dr. Smellie's, on the other hand, as its list of editions shows, is a typically popular book, of the number of which there is no end. It is thoroughly emotional, and a travesty of history.

Both these books must be read to be believed, and then they cannot be believed.

As many as possible of these popular books on the Covenant should be read to realize how continuously and without scruple fiction has been served up as fact. Amongst these books, all ludicrous in their extreme sentimentality, are:

Guthrie's *Tales of the Covenanters*, and Thomson's *Martyr Graves of Scotland*, both obtainable secondhand at a low price.

Obviously the writer is not concerned to advertise more recent books, either entirely absurd, or written on the same old lines. On the statement of the author of one of these latter, why should they be advertised when he avers that "no claim is made for originality in the telling of the tale, or for newness of material"?

II. Books by Non-Presbyterians

Scotland's Church, by the late Rt. Rev. A. Mitchell, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney. Third edition revised 1933, 2*s*. net. David Winter & Son, 15 Shore Terrace, Aberdeen.

An admirable little history, written in a fair and generous spirit.

**The Loyal Clans*. Audrey Cunningham, 1932.

This, the work of a scholar, gives much little-

known information regarding the Scottish Episcopal Church in the Highlands.

* The current *Year Book of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* is full of valuable historical notes.

* From all these books (except the last) extensive quotations have been made throughout the chapters on the Covenanters. From the last, in the three last chapters.

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

In making any serious study of a subject, there are obvious primary sources, all well known, such as *Calendars of State Papers*, and, in this case, *Acts of Parliament of Scotland*; the *Register of the Scots Privy Council*; Spalding's *Memorials*; Lord Fountainhall's numerous historical works (for the years 1665 to 1712 inclusive); *Queensberry's MSS.*, etc., etc., that naturally come into the course of one's reading. But quite apart from the length to which an all-inclusive list would run, the object of this bibliography is rather to indicate the books on all sides, with the balance on the Presbyterian, which show to some extent how universally and persistently Scotland's history has been suppressed in the interests of Presbyterianism, and more especially of the Covenanters. In respect of these, contemporary writings *have* been included, as affording one of the best guides to the truth about them. Many books, by partisan Presbyterians, are but a number of artificial bushes made, to show—by the exception that proves the rule—how good Presbyterian vintage really is.

In order to avoid giving umbrage to patriotic Presbyterians, no works of any English secular historians have been permitted to intrude. The

inclusion of English writers was inevitable, however, as regards the first division of the bibliography, since apparently no Presbyterian author has written on any but one of its subjects. This is the *Church and the Ministry*, by the world-renowned scholar, the late Dr. Gore, whose vast erudition overshadows all others in his own sphere.

All Presbyterian histories and Covenanting books are marked P. and C. respectively; and the few Episcopalian histories, E. Of other books named there is a large literature dealing with the persecution etc. of the Episcopalians and the unpopularity of Presbyterianism, of which facts Presbyterians generally are wholly unaware, and if any Presbyterian writer knew of them, he has modestly concealed that knowledge.

The writer has collected much oral information locally from the descendants of the old native Episcopalian families in the Episcopalian districts of Scotland through which she has tramped, and has been at great pains to test its accuracy. Unless satisfied of this, it was rejected.

Church History Tracts, published under auspices of the [English] Church Historical Society, 57 tracts, 1894–1900.

Bright, W., *The Age of the Fathers*, 2 vols., 1903.

Brightman, F. E., edited by, *Liturgies East and West*, 1896.

Coulton, G. G., *Papal Infallibility*, 1932. *Romanism and Truth*, Vol. I, 1930; Vol. II, 1931.

Denny, Edward, *Papalism*, 1912.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, edited by Dom F. Cabrol, 1910–.

Gore, Charles, (revised by C. N. Turner), *Church and the Ministry*, 1919. *Orders and Unity*, 1919.

MacLeod, Donald, *Ministry and Sacraments of the Church of Scotland*. P.

Palmer, William, *Treatise of the Church of Christ*, Two volumes, 1842.

Pullan, Leighton, *The Church of the Fathers*, A.D. 98 *to* A.D 461, 1906. *The Christian Tradition*, 1908.

[Roman] Catholic Truth Societies Publications.

Salmon, George, *The Infallibility of the Church*, 1914.

Story, Herbert, *Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church*. P.

Brown, P. Hume, *History of Scotland*—used in Scottish elementary schools. P.

Burton, J. H., *History of Scotland*, 8 volumes, 1897. P.

Lang, Andrew, *History of Scotland*, 4 volumes, 1900–07. E.

Wright, Thos., *History of Scotland*, 3 volumes, N.D. P.

Bellesheim, A., *History of Catholic Church in Scotland*, 2 volumes, 1890. R.C.

Calderwood, D., *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 8 volumes, 1842–9. P.

Cunningham, J., *Church History of Scotland*, 2 volumes, 1882. P. Very fair indeed.

Grub, G., *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, 4 volumes, 1861. E.

Hay, M. V., *Chain of Error in Scottish History*, 1927. R.C.

Stephen, Thos., *History of Church of Scotland*, 4 volumes, 1843. E.

Stephen, W., *History of Scottish Church*, 2 volumes, 1896. E.

Bede, The Venerable, *Ecclesiastical History*—A.D. 731. (In Everyman's Library.)

Dowden, John, *Celtic Church in Scotland*, 1894.

Forbes, A. P., *Kalendar of Scottish Saints*, 1872.

Forbes, A.P., edited by, *Lives of S. S. Ninian and Kentigern*, 1874. (Vol. V, *Historians of Scotland*.)

Reeves, W., edited by W. F. Skene, *Adamnan's Life of S. Columba*, 1874. (Vol. VI of above.) *The Culdees of British Islands*, 1864.

Skene, W. F., *Celtic Scotland, Vol. II*, 1890.

Warren, F. E., *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, 1881.

Knox, John, *Collected Works*, edited by D. Laing, 6 volumes, 1846, etc.

Lang, Andrew, *John Knox and the Reformation*, 1915.

M'Crie, Thos., *Life of Knox*, 2 volumes, 1813, *Life of Andrew Melville*, edited 1856.

McMillan, W., *Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church*, 1550–1638, 1931. P.

Mathieson, W. L., *Politics and Religion*, 2 vols., 1902. P.

Maxwell, W. D., *John Knox's Genevan Service Book*, 1556, 1931. P.

Sprott, George, *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*. P.

Wakeman, H. O., and Pullan, Leighton, *The Reformation of the Church in Great Britain*, 1907.

Winzet, Ninian, Works: *Tractates*; *Last Trumpet of God's Word, etc., To the Calvinian Preachers: Four Score Three Questions, etc.*, written 1562–63. Maitland Club, 1835. An invaluable book.

Scott, Hew, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticane.—The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation*, new edition published by Committee of the General Assembly, 7 volumes, 1913-28.

Anon., *The Epistle Congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor of the Societie of Jesu, to the Covenanters in Scotland*, 1640. [By J. Maxwell, Bishop of Ross.]

Baillie, *Letters etc.* (*circa* 1638), 3 vols., 1842. C.

Belloc, Hilaire, *Charles the First*, 1933. R.C.

Brodie, Alex Brodie of, *Diary* 1652–1680. C.

Brodie, James Brodie of, *Diary* 1680–1685. Spalding Club, 1863. C.

Brown, James, *History of Highlands and Clans*, 4 volumes, 1838.

* Calder, R., *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Display'd*, 1789. E.

Johnston of Wariston's Diary, Scot. Hist. Society, 1896–7. C.

Keith, R., edited by M. Russel, *Catalogue of Scottish Bishops*, 1824. E.

Lang, Andrew, *Life and Times of Sir George Mackenzie, etc., of Rosehaugh*, 1636–91. 1908.

Mackintosh, W. L., *Life of William Laud*, 1907. E.

Peterkin, Alex., *Records of the Kirk of Scotland*, (*circa* 1638), 1838. C.

Row, John, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*. 1558–1637. 2 volumes, 1842. C.

Rutherford, Samuel, (1600–1661), *Lex Rex*, 1843. C. *Religious Letter*, 1783. C.

St. Bernard, Some Letters of, edited by F. A. Gasquet, 1904.

St. Bernard, *The Song of Songs*, selections made by Blaxland Bruce, 1901.

Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory of Public Worship, etc., 1928.

Wodrow, R., (1679–1734) *Analecta*, 4 volumes, 1842. C.

Wodrow Society Miscellany, *Lives of Bruce, Dickson, Blair, Livingston*. C.

* There is at least one "reply" to this—"Jacob Curate's" book, which is a far stronger indictment of Presbyterianism than is *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Display'd* This is the *Answer* of "Will Laick"—one George Redpath, a journalist and bigamist. It is far too filthy and lewd a book for any but a "New Moralist" to quote

A Cloud of Witnesses, secretly printed in 1714, Later, 1871. C.

"A Southern"—*The Despot's Champion*, 1889.

Howie, John, of Lochgoin (1755-1793) *Scots Worthies*, 1902. C.

Kirkton, James, *Secret and True History of Scotland from the Restoration to the Year* 1678, 1817. C.

Renwick, J., (with Alex. Shields), *An Informatory Vindication of a poor wasted misrepresented Remnant of the suffering Anti-Popish, Anti-Prelatick, Anti-Erastian, Anti-Sectarian, true Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland. Written at the Leadhills in the year* 1687, 1744. C.

Shields, Alex., (1660?–1700), *Hind Let Loose*, 1770. C.

Shields, Michael, *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, 1703. C.

Stewart, J., of Goodtrees, *Jus Populi Vindicatum*, secretly printed in 1669. C.

Stewart, J., of Goodtrees, and J. Stirling, *Naphthali*, 1667. C.

Terry, C. S., *John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount of Dundee*, 1905.

Walker, Patrick, edited by D. H. Fleming, *Six Saints of the Covenant*, 1901. C.

Warrack, J., *Moderators of the Church of Scotland from* 1690–1740, 1913. P.

Wodrow, R., (1679–1734), *History of Sufferings of Church of Scotland*, 2 volumes, 1721. *Correspondence*, 3 volumes, 1842.

Anon., *Highlands of Scotland in* 1750, (contemporary) introduction by Andrew Lang. Anti-E.

Archibald, J., *A Ten Year's Conflict*, 1907. E.

A Representation of the State of the Church in North Britain as to Episcopacy and Liturgy; and of the sufferings of the Regular and Orthodox from the enemies to both, etc., 1718. E.

An Apology for such of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland as are non-jurors. Taken from the unprecedented Hardships put upon them by the Presbyterians, etc., 1818. E.

Case of the afflicted Clergy of Scotland truly represented. By a Lover of his Church and Country. 1690.

Craven, J. B., *Diocese of Caithness*, 1908. E.

Craven, J. B., edited by, *Journals and Episcopal Visitations of the Rt. Rev. Robert Forbes*, 1886. E.

Craven, J. B., *Records of the Diocese of Argyll and the Isles*, 1907. E.

Henderson, G. D., *Mystics of the North-East*. 1934.

Mackay, W., *Sidelights on Highland History*, 1925.

Presbyterian Inquisition as it was lately practised against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh. P.

Walker, J., *Life of John Skinner of Linshart*, 1883.

INDEX

NOTE.—To save confusion the clumsy terms "Episcopalianism" and its cognate "Episcopalian" have been used to cover everything connected with the old disestablished Church of Scotland, except bishops and archbishops who will be found under *Bishop*. Other prelates, e.g. Laud and Seabury, will be found under their own names. Under *Presbyterianism* and *Presbyterians* or the *Covenants* and *Covenanters* will be found all associated with them. The latter (Covenants and Covenanters) covers the pre-Revolution period, the former the post-Revolution. A few ministers who overlap both periods will be found under both. Lists of ministers will be found under both headings, those under *Presbyterianism* being restricted to those after the Revolution. The only exceptions are the few ministers, such as Knox and Melville, who will be found under their own names. All Acts of Parliament, no matter how their style begins, will be found under *Acts*.

ABERDEEN, City of 304–315, 336–339
"Aberdeen Doctors," 305
Abjuration Oath, Terms of, 194
Acts:
- Abjuration, 221, 228
- Church, Settling Quiet and and Peace of, 248, 312
- (of) Classes, 144
- Disorders, etc., for Preventing, 250, 297
- Episcopacy, Proscribing and Penalising, 248, 254–6
- Recissory, 178
- Test, 179, 181
- Toleration, 52, 93, 253; quoted 324, 325
- Union, 51

Aikenhead, Thomas, hanged, 245
Apostolic Constitutions, 36
Argyll, Gley-eyed Marquis, 85, 112, 159–61, 235 *n*.
- In Aberdeen, 311

Assembly—*see* under General Assembly

BERNARD, St., quoted 164, 165, 170
Bishops (including Archbishops):
- Beaton, last Papal Abp. of Glasgow, 42 *n*
- Forbes, Robert, of Ross and Caithness, quoted, 277
- Leighton, of Dunblane, later Abp. of Glasgow, quoted 167

Bishops, etc.—*contd.*
Lindesay, of Edinburgh, 68, 69
Paterson, of Edinburgh, later of Glasgow, 180, 192
Ramsay, of Dunblane, 88
Rose, of Edinburgh, 72–75; interviewed in London, 239
Sharp, Abp of S. Andrew's, 78 *n*, 82, 155, 180; character of, 183
Skinner, John, of Aberdeen, 336
Spottiswoode, Abp. of Glasgow and S. Andrew's, his educational schemes, 129
Wishart, of Edinburgh, 78, 79, 180
Bishops:
Charge against first reformed, 97, 98
Consecration of, 42
Excommunication of, 98, 99
"Black Prelatists," 285
"Bluidy Banner," 121–124
Bothwell Brig, battle of, 115, 116
Brown, John, case of, 221–226
Brownen, nephew of above, 226

CALVINISM, 39–40
Canons of Hippolytus, 36
Carmarthen, Marquis of, in defence of Episcopal clergy, 249
Catholic, meaning of, 37
Celtic Church, position of Bishops in, 33, 34
Charles I, 52
Character, 44, 52
Clergy, support of, 128, 129
Covenanters, surrender to, 137; sale by? 138, 139
Charles I—*contd.*
Despotic action, 128
Edinburgh, foundation of See, 62
Educational schemes, support of, 129
Forced to attend Presbyterian preachings, 70
Intrigue against, 136, 137
Quoted, 29
Religion, 45, 137
Solemn League and Covenant, attitude to, 140
Charles II:
Character of, 49, 50, 52
Covenanters declare war against, 191
Signs Covenants, 148
Churches, old, in Presbyterian possession:
Aberdeen—King's College, Chapel, 311, 312
St. Machar's, 311, 312
St. Nicholas, 311
Dunfermline Abbey, 38
Edinburgh, St Giles', 38
Glasgow, St. Mungo's, 38
Claim of Right, 240
Claverhouse:
John, Graham of, Viscount Dundee, 114, 115, 126, 187
Care for horses, 207; soldiers, 214, 215, 233
Character generally, 236, 237
Compassion for prisoners, 207, 208
Conduct, upright, 208, 209, 210, 215
Death of, 235
Devotion inspired by, 234
Duty, attitude and devotion to, 212, 213, 234, 235

Claverhouse—*contd.*
Executions, 218–230
Expenditure, personal, on King's service, 209
Generalship, 232, 233, 234
Justice, sense of, 213
Letters to Linlithgow, 206, 207, 213, 214; Queensberry, 204, 205, 210, 211, 216, 221, 222
Marriage, 231
Montrose, compared with, 232, 234, 236
Policy, 204, 205, 210, 212
Portraits, 202
Relic of, at Old Deer, 323, 324
Religion, 231, 235, 236
Colkitto, Old, 113; Young, 311
Columba, St., 33, 35; in Ardnamurchan, 286
Consecrations *per saltum*, 42
COVENANTS:
Ambiguity of wording of National Covenant, 130
Burning of National Covenant, 88
Children's Covenant or Bond, 148–9
Claims of Covenant contrasted with those of Episcopacy, 48
Declared illegal and treasonable, 194
Forced support of, 306–7
Hatred of, 177
National Covenant:
Extracts from, 55, 75, 142
Origin of, 128
Places in country against, 349
Predecessors of, 129
Signing of, 75
Covenants—*contd.*
Forced signing, 131, 306, 307
Solemn League and Covenant, 101, 132, 134, 197, 200; extracts from, 133–4
State of country under Covenants, 142–3
COVENANTERS:
All extremists, 183–4
Alliance with English Puritans, 134–5
Banners, 115–6
Bargaining over Charles I, 138–9
Blood lust of, 79–81, 87, 112, 141–2, 193
Cameronians or Hillmen, 187
Character of, 46, 49
Characteristics of, 177–9
Claims of, 203
Declarations of, 188–90 and *n*, 191
Excommunications by, 98, 99, 142, 189
Immoralities of, 143, 308, 309
Ministers: 77, 80, 112, 113, 140, 152; compared with Episcopalian clergy, 179–180
Spirit of, 79, 85, 147
Victims of, 82–4, 114–7, 142, 193, 308, 309
Virtues of, 150–1
Ministers, individual:
Baillie, Robert, quoted, 97
Blair, Robert, 80, 153, 172
Cameron, Richard, 187, 189
Cargill, Donald, 187–90; excommunicates King, etc., 189–90
Dickson, David, 87, 304
Dickson, John, quoted, 195

Covenanters: Ministers—*contd.*
Douglas, Robert, 177
Douglas, Thomas, 114
Guthrie, James, 155
Guthrie, William, quoted, 195
Henderson, Alexander, 98 99, 180, 304, 306
Kennedie, Hew, 147
Kidd, John, 118
King, John, 118
Moncrief, William, 172
Nevay, John, 112, 113, 140
Renwick, James, 190–192
Robertson, quoted, 216
Rutherford, Samuel, 152–4, 170, 304, quoted 163
Selkirk, Matthew, quoted, 168–173
Semple, John, quoted, 186
Shields, Alexander, 165; quoted, 166, 196
Traill, Robert, 77
Welsh, John, 173, 203–204
Williamson, David, quoted, 171
Money exactions made by, 306–307
Ordination dropped by, 92
Treason of, 136–137, 181
Treatment of prisoners, 79–81
Tombstones of, 218–219, 229
John Brown, 221
Robert Cameron, 220 *n*
Thomas Flemming, 229
Andrew Hislop, 228
Andrew Richmond, 229
War preparations of, 95

DALRYMPLE, SIR JAMES, 192, 208; Sir John [Glencoe], 208, 230, 231
Darnley, Lord, in St. Giles', 66, 67
Defoe, Daniel, quoted, 217, 218
Directory of Public Worship, 43, 75–76, 118, 119
Drumclog, battle of, 114, 115, 117
Dumfries and Dumfriesshire, 202, 206, 212, 213, 228
Dunaverty, massacre of, 111, 112, 113
Dundee, Viscount—*see* under Claverhouse

EDINBURGH:
Old St Pauls', 72–74
Parliament House, 71
Regiment, or K.O.S B, 71, 72
St. Giles', 62, 71, 72–74, 82
King Charles I's attendance forced there, 70
Knox's preaching to Darnley in, 66, 67
Riot in, 68, 69
St. Mary's Cathedral, 63, 64, 93
See of, founded, 67
Tolbooth Kirk, 64, 65
"English" Church, 28, 54, 254, 255

EPISCOPACY:
Historic, 35–36
Scottish:
Acts relieving, 258
Address of poor farmers, 332–336
"Advertisement" sent to clergy of Aberdeenshire, 325–326, letter following, 326–327
Anomalies of, 40
Catholic principles: firm hold on, 283, 294–5, 330, 333–336, 338, 341–344

Episcopacy—*contd*
Challenge to Presbyterian Ministers, 312
Claims contrasted with those of Covenant, 47–49
Covenanters on, 195–196
Decreets of ejection against clergy, 331
Disestablishment, first, 95, final, 240
"Faithful Remnant", 53
Jacobitism, not synonymous with, 45–49, 53, 247 and *n*
Meeting-houses and chapels of, burnt, 257, 302, 336
Mock, 39, 42 *n*
People's love of, 316–317
Position of, in 1660, 177–178; in 1689, 239, 242
"Qualified" clergy and congregations of, 254
Restoration of, first, 42; second, 46
Strongholds, sometime and present, 281–3, 288–303
Aberdeenshire, 311, 330
Appin, 218, 284
Ardnamurchan, 287–8
Ballachulish, St. John's, 275–277
Blair Atholl, Kilmaveonaig, 260–262
Buckie, All Saints', 269
Dingwall, St. James the Great, 279, 290, 291
Edinburgh, Old St. Pauls', 72–74
Glasgow, St. Andrew's, 259
Glencoe, St. Mary's, 275
Glenorchy, 270
Episcopacy. Strongholds of—*contd.*
Keith, Holy Trinity, 262
Kelso, St. Andrew's, 260
Kirriemuir, St. Mary's, 269
Morvern, 285
Ross-shire, 289–303
Suddie, 301–302
Worship, 106, 197, in secret, 276, 281, 282
EPISCOPALIANS:
Catechists, 302
Clergy, compared with Covenanting Ministers, 47, 48, 101
Clergy (for bishops and archbishops *see* under Bishops):
Noteworthy:
Dunbar, Rev. William, (later bp.), 327
Hannay, Dean, 67–9
MacColl, Rev. Paul, 277–284
Macdonald, Rev. Alexander, 287
Mackenzie, Archdeacon Duncan, 278–281
MacLachlan, Rev. John, 276–285
Clergy, or Curates, persecuted or rabbled:
Bell, Rev. Robert, 197–199
Cockburn, Rev. ——., 119
Connacher, Rev. James, 258
Dunbreck, Rev. ——., 314
Garden, Dr. George, 312–14
George, Rev. Alexander, 103
Gordon, Rev. John, 315
Greenshields, Rev. James, 90–3
Greig, Rev. Alex, 257

Episcopalians: Clergy—*contd.*
Guthrie, Rev. Gideon, 331
Hay, Rev. ——., 331
Little, Rev. James, 199–200
Livingstone, Rev. Wm., 323
Maitland, Rev. John, 329–31
Milne, Rev. ——, 102, 104–5
Pearson, Rev. Peter, murder of, 193
Petrie, Rev. J., 257
Russell, Rev. Gabriel, 102
Skinner, Rev. John, (Tullochgorum), 336
Stewart, Rev. Walter, 258
Troup, Rev. J., 257
Conduct of, under persecution, 53
"Curates, The", 99–100
Poverty of Clergy, 251, 252
Preponderating at Revolution, 242–46, 247 and *n*
Repel Presbyterian intruders, 267, 268–270, 296, 319, 321–323

GALLOWAY, 193, 208, 210, 213, 230
Geddes, Jenny, fiction of, 68–70; the real, 69
General Assembly, 40
of 1610, 42, 94
of 1638, 95, 97–9
of 1690, 245
on toleration, 251 *n*
George I and George II, 52
Glasgow:
Assembly of 1638, 95, 97–9
Orange gangs, 174, 175
Rabbling at, 102, 103
St. Mungo's, 94, 95
University of, 106
Glencoe, massacre of, 272–74
Glencoe, Macdonalds of, Episcopalians, 272, 274, 275
Gore, Dr., quoted, 36
Greyfriars, Edinburgh, 75–7

HAMILTON, BARBARA, 68, 69
Hamilton, Sir Robert, 114, 115
Hislop, case of, 228

INDULGENCES, THE, 183, 184, 203

JACOB CURATE, quoted, 158, 166–170, 174, 185; his catechism, 176, 200
Jacobitism and Episcopacy, 48, 49, 255, 256
James VI, 41, 42, 44
James VII, 50, 52, 190
Jerome, St., quoted, 35
Johnson, Dr., at Episcopal Churches, 255, 315
Jurisdiction *versus* Holy Order, 34

KING'S OWN SCOTTISH BORDERERS, origin of, 73
Kirkcudbright, Covenanting violence at, 193; Church, 211
Knox John, 66, 67
"Appellation" of, 57, 58
Barbarities, defence of, 165
Character, 37, 56–8
Destroyer of Churches, 37, 61
Education, plans for, 129
"Forme of Prayer," 39, 66–7
Grave of, 71
Ministry, alleged call to, 59, 60
Opinions of, 191
Patriotism of, 188
Priesthood, reununciation of, 59
Winzet, posed by, 60, 61

LAMBERT, ST., 35
Laud, Archbishop, 67, 98, 99
Lauderdale, Duke of, 182, 190
Leslie, David, Covenanting General, 85, 111, 112, 113
Linlithgow, massacre near, 86, burning of Covenant at, 88, 89
Loyal Clans, quoted, 177, 178, 236, 237

MACAULAY, quoted, 222, 223, 224, 225
Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh, 182, 183
"Martyrs' Monument", Edinburgh, 81, 82
Melville, Andrew, 38, 65, 66
Middleton, Lord, 182
Monmouth, Duke of, 110, 114, 115, 190
Montrose, Churches at, 255
Montrose, Marquis of:
  As Covenanter, 130, 160–62, in Aberdeen, 304, 306–8
  As Royalist, 310, 311
  Covenant, signing of, 75
  Monument to, 82
  Philiphaugh, Covenanting leader at, 85
  Prisoners, treatment of, 78
  Tippermuir, incident after battle of, 48
Murder, what constitutes, 219, 220

NINIAN, ST., 33, 34

OGILVIE, LORD, 78, 79
Ogilvy of Inverquharity, 79
Ogilvy of Powrie, 78

PAPALISM, affinity with Presbyterianism, 29, 96, 99, 124, 130, 135, 136, 139, 140, 144, 156–158, 178, 187, 238, 245, 312
Perth, Five Articles of, 47
Philiphaugh, Battle of, 85, 86
Prayer Book:
  Assembly legislate against, 252, 253
  English introduced, 53, 54, 90
  Gaelic, 54, 275, 278
  Presbyterian interference, modern, 252
  Scottish, first, of 1637, 53, 54, 67; further editions of, 54
  Use of Liturgy, 198, 253, 257, 313, 314

PRESBYTERIANISM, 38–40
  Affinity with Papalism, 29, 96, 99, 124, 130, 135, 136, 139, 140, 144, 156–158, 178, 187, 238, 245, 312
  Blood, zeal for, 80, 87
  Churches, Government or Parliamentary, 242, 281, 283, 287
  Claim to ordain, 36
  Denial of Episcopal Orders, 91–2, 319
  Erastianism of, 91, 240–42, 319
  Establishment of, quasi, 37; true, 39; second, 45, 46, 95, 96; final, 240, 241
  False claims, 30
  Foreign origin, 40–3
  Free Church, origin of, 298–300
  Funerals, 119
  Holy days, opposition to, 318
  Inclination of people shown, 274–336
  Intolerance of, 20–1
  Judaism, 23, 165, 175, 244

Presbyterianism—*contd.*
Letter authorizing military action against Episcopacy, 327–28
Ministry, Government, 242, 327; quality of Revolution and subsequent, 246, 288, 289
"Penitent Stool", 244–45
Place of Worship, typical, 64–65
"Planting of Churches": Avoch, 296–98; Dingwall, 290; Gairloch, 291–93, Kilmorack, 291; Knockbain, 293–96, Rathven, 263–69. By force of arms · Ardnamurchan, 287, Cruden, 327; Forgue, 328; Glenelg, 300; Pitsligo, 327; St. Fergus, 327
Position of, in 1662, 178
Prayer Book, opposition to Episcopalians' use of, 198, 253, 313–14, 328
Protesters or Remonstrants, 153
Quakers, persecution of, 249-250
Resolutioners, 153
Sabbatarianism, 22, 243, 244, 308, 318

PRESBYTERIANS ·
Ministers mentioned .
Carstares, William, 239
Gordon, Robt, 266–8
Kennedie, Hew, 147
MacLauchlan, Daniel, 288
Shields, Alexander, 165–66, quoted, 196
Wodrow, Robert, 217, 228, 231; his aim, 215

Presbyterians.—*contd.*
Ministers, paucity of after Revolution, 242, 289–90
Not synonymous with Scots, 28, 29, 33, 58
Psalms, metrical, 43, 112, 113, 141
Pseudo-Presbyterianism, 38, 39, 43, 44, 47 *n*, 65, 66, 75, 76, 117

QUAKERS, persecution of, 249
Queen Anne, 51, 54
Episcopalian addresses to, 251, 341–45
Presbyterian reply to, 252
Presbyterian petition to, 253
Queensberry, Lord, 215
Queensferry Paper, 188

REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND, 37
Restoration Government, character of, 181, 182; and Episcopacy, 179, 184
Restoration of Monarchy, 176 *et seq.*
Rollo, Sir William, 79
Rothes, Lord, 182, 190
Rullion Green, battle of, 216

SANQUHAR, Covenanting declarations there, 187, 191
Seabury, Samuel, first bishop of American Church, 73, 280, 281; consecration service and scene of, 337, 338; memorial tablet of consecration, 338, 339; welcome by his clergy, 338
Snell, John, 106, 107
Exhibition to Oxford, 107
Exhibition disputed at law, 108, 109
Wish ignored, 109–11

Spottiswoode, Sir Robert, 79, 81
Stewart, James, of the Glen, 281, 282
Stornoway, Church work in, 22
Strafford, Earl of, 132
Sufferings of the Kirk, etc, quoted, 184–86

TROT OF TURRIFF, 307
"True Blue Presbyterians", 285, 306

WARR, DR. C. L., quoted, 158, 270, 271
Walker, Patrick, his variations on Wodrow, 224, 225; quoted, 186, 187
Warristoun, Johnston of, 80, 132, 136, 141, 161, 162
Whig or Whiggamore, 193
William of Orange, 74, 103, 240
  Interview with Bishop Rose, 239
  Subsidises English education in Highlands, 250
Winzet, Ninian, 57–61
Witch hunting, 144–47
Wodrow, Robert, 217, 228, 231; his aim, 235

YORK, ARCHBISHOPS OF, 41